



LIBRARY OF PRINCETON

SEP 05 2003

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

ADDITIONAL MEMORIAL

ON

PRINTING AND IMPORTING BIBLES:

CONTAINING

REMARKS ON THE ANSWERS

FOR

SIR DAVID HUNTER BLAIR, BART. AND J. BRUCE, ESQ.

HIS MAJESTY'S PRINTERS,

TO

THE PETITION

OF

GEORGE BUCHAN, ESQ. AND OTHERS.

WITH A CONTINUATION OF THE APPENDIX TO THE FORMER MEMORIAL.

FOR THE USE OF COUNSEL ONLY.

BY

JOHN LEE, D.D., LL.D., F.R.S.E.

A MEMBER OF THE EDINBURGH BIBLE SOCIETY.

EDINBURGH :

PRINTED BY A. BALFOUR AND CO.

1826.

THIS pamphlet is a sequel to the Memorial for the Bible Societies, printed in 1824. It denies that the power of conferring an exclusive privilege of printing the Bible is a legitimate branch of the royal prerogative. It proves that recent claims to the monopoly of the Bible are not supported by the practice even of the most despotic periods of our history. It exposes the inaccuracy of many editions published by privileged printers, and maintains that the greater the restraint on competition, the less must be the security either for cheap or correct impressions of the Scriptures.

The Appendix is a continuation of that which was annexed to the former Memorial, and which ended at the 94th page. The Tables at the end contain proofs of the practice of importing copies of the English Bible, ever since it was translated, and proofs not less ample, of the unrestrained liberty which all printers enjoyed, of printing the other books used in public worship, and in religious instruction, such as the allowed version of the Psalms, the Westminster Confession, and the Catechisms of the Church.

REMARKS, &c.

IT is stated in the commencement of this paper, that as the real defenders in the case between the respondents and the Booksellers of Edinburgh, were the King's printers of England, who were at the sole expense of the suit, the success on the part of the petitioners would be entirely for the benefit of the English patentees; and though it is not directly asserted, it appears to be insinuated that these persons, who are represented as having so deep an interest at stake, have still a concern in the proceedings for which the members of the Bible Societies are alone responsible.

So far, however, are we from being countenanced or supported by the English patentees, that the grounds on which we are most disposed to make a stand, are such as they have never thought it prudent or safe to venture upon. We cannot, however, perceive how it is possible that the success of our plea should be for the benefit of the English patentees, if it be true, as is stated in the third page of the answers, that "the Bibles furnished by the respondents are, in point of neatness, accuracy,

variety, and cheapness, equal, if not superior to any that can be got in England." If the respondents furnish an equally good, or even better article, at an inferior price, is it conceivable that we should be so capricious, or so lavish of the funds contributed by our constituents, as in direct opposition to our own interest and theirs to go to a distant market for what we might so easily obtain at home? It has uniformly been our object to employ our limited resources with the strictest regard to economy; and in the present case, we do not overlook the temporal interest of the poorer classes of the community. But it is chiefly for their spiritual benefit that we are concerned; and even if it were true, that in all past time the Bibles printed in Scotland have been better and cheaper than those which have been imported from England, we would still account it our duty to resist the attempt to establish a monopoly which has never existed in Scotland before, and which, if once established, would leave the public at the mercy of one or two individuals, not merely with regard to the price, (which, though of great moment to the poor, is still a minor consideration,) but in the far more important article of correctness.

On the quality and prices of the editions furnished by the respondents, as compared with those which have been imported from England by the petitioners, we repeat our former assertion, that we have obtained our supply from England on terms much more favourable than we could have done by going to the King's warehouse in Edinburgh. Possibly we may be persons of very weak judgment, and still meaner taste; but, to our unrefined appre-

hensions, the Bible printed at Oxford in 1823, and sold to us in sheets at fourteen shillings, while we durst buy them, appears in every respect as good, and as handsome, and as accurate, as the boasted royal quarto printed by the respondents in 1822, and sold by them for £.1, 6s. without apocrypha. In the same manner, we were accustomed to receive Oxford, Cambridge, and London Bibles, of various sizes, some of them 30, and others 40 per cent below the Edinburgh prices ; and besides this, we had the opportunity of supplying our subscribers with several useful editions, printed in a size of letter, which the respondents did not think fit to employ.

We are certainly not a little astonished at the grave asseveration of the respondents, that their editions, in point of *variety*, are equal, if not superior to any that can be got in England. No doubt they have exhibited at the end of their appendix two tables, the *first* containing *a catalogue* of Bibles and New Testaments printed by Sir David Hunter Blair, and John Bruce, with the wholesale prices, August 1825 ; and the second table containing (they do not say *a catalogue*, but simply) Bibles and New Testaments printed by Messrs. Eyre and Strahan, with the wholesale prices, August 1825. Any ordinary reader would suppose that this second table is a transcript of one of the lists published by the English patentees, exhibiting all the varieties of forms in which they publish the sacred books. It so happens, that in each table, the number of Bibles is ten ; but in the first, or the table for Scotland, the number of New Testaments is five, and in the second, or that for England, the

number is only four. Is it then so that the King's printers for Scotland, print as great a variety of Bibles as the King's printers for England, and a greater variety of New Testaments? We dare not venture to answer, as we may not be permitted to produce the Bibles printed in London, to verify our assertion. But if we can trust the catalogue of Messrs. Eyre and Strahan, they print exactly double the number of English Bibles, and double the number of English New Testaments, which the respondents have been pleased to ascribe to them, namely, twenty Bibles and eight New Testaments, besides a Bible in Manx, and another in Welsh, as well as a New Testament in Welsh. Moreover, it so happens, that the first table dignifies some of its articles by the epithet *superfine*, without deigning to admit, in the corresponding part of the second table, the humbler term *fine*, or some other characteristics of the paper and ink, which the London printers may have been too presumptuous in claiming. In the catalogue of Messrs. Eyre and Strahan, several articles are represented as being of *fine* wove royal paper, best ink, cold pressed—circumstances which add prodigiously to the expense, we imagine, as we observe that the last article in the Edinburgh list is double the price of the immediately preceding article, as being of *superfine* paper, cold pressed, without claiming the advantage of the *best* ink. We say farther, that few of the articles in the two tables can be fairly represented as corresponding in quality. The Edinburgh quarto, demy paper, small pica letter, being the second article in the first list, is not to be compared with the London quarto, (the second in the second list,) which, besides being print-

ed on a very superior paper, is quite a different type. Pica is a type so much larger than small pica, that a page of the latter contains nearly as much as two pages of the other, and accordingly the Bible printed in the one type, requires nearly double the quantity of paper. Another circumstance worthy of notice, with regard to Nos. 2, 3, 5, and 6, in the first table is, that they are said to have marginal references ; but they are not said, like Nos. 2, 4, and 5, of the second table, to have Dr. Blaney's marginal references, which being greatly more numerous than the common references, fill a much larger space, and occasion a very considerable addition to the expense of printing. No 6 of the Edinburgh list, does not correspond with No. 5 of the London editions enumerated by the respondents, either in the references, or the quality of paper. The one paper is medium, and the other, though honoured with the title of superfine demy, is not nearly so good as medium.

The prices charged by the London printers are therefore not nearly so extravagant as the comparative view presented by the respondents would lead us to infer ; for the commodity furnished by them is decidedly superior. But the prices paid by the Bible Societies, owing to the great numbers which they have purchased, have been 30, or 40, or sometimes 50 per cent. lower than the quotations in these lists. And, besides the advantage of cheapness, they have had a much greater choice in the articles furnished in the English market. Messrs. Eyre and Strahan, for instance, have in their catalogue ten octavo Bibles, in place of the three octavos of the respondents, one of which is only in

the press. Two of the London octavos are in *small pica* type, without references,—two in *long primer* type, without references,—two in *brevier* type, without references,—two in *minion* type, without references,—and two in *brevier* type, with Dr. Blaney's marginal references. Of the twenty-four, two of the London editions are in *minion* type, which the Edinburgh printers have used only in one of their New Testaments. But the varieties of English Bibles are much greater than any one would imagine, who contents himself with an inspection of the list of Messrs. Eyre and Strahan's editions. At Oxford the Bible is printed in several sizes and types, not advertised by Messrs. Eyre & Strahan; as royal folio, *double pica* letter, medium quarto, crown quarto, medium octavo, *small pica* type, and crown octavo, with references. At Cambridge, several editions are produced, to which nothing parallel can be obtained either at Oxford, or at the depository of Eyre & Strahan in Paternoster-row,—for instance, a demy folio, as well as a royal folio, a demy quarto, inferior, at 6s. 5d., a medium octavo, *small pica*, with references, and several others, with parallel passages and marginal readings. Messrs. Eyre & Strahan, on the other hand, furnish a variety of Bibles which cannot be procured from either of the University presses; and if we were required to match the Bibles of the Scottish patentees, we could produce *thirty* varieties for their *ten*. The various forms of the Cambridge Bible at present are at least seventeen, and of the New Testament five,—of the Oxford Bible at least seventeen, and of the New Testament seven,—of the London

Bible not fewer than twenty, and of the New Testament eight. *

It does not, perhaps, belong to us, as a Bible Society, to take notice, that instead of four or five sizes of the Book of Common Prayer, to be had at the King's Warehouse in Edinburgh, such of us as are of the communion of the Church of England had formerly the power of obtaining nearly thirty various forms and sizes of that book, of which Messrs. Eyre & Strahan print ten, while Oxford furnishes eighteen varieties, and Cambridge more than twenty. If it were only a matter of luxury, we might consider it as no small hardship to be precluded from indulging it, in the same manner as a man of fashion would wince at the indignity of being compelled to array himself, Sunday and Saturday, in Galashiels gray, or some other plain apparel of home manufacture, sufficient, no doubt, for all the purposes of comfort, but not so becoming or agreeable as the cold pressed superfine cloth of Spanish wool, and English or French workmanship. The King's printers tell us, that their books are equal or superior in quality to any which we can bring from the south; but we know that they are mistaken: and, however unreasonable it may appear to them that we should not be satisfied with their manufacture, we cannot help telling them, that for more than 280 years the people of Scotland have generally given a preference to English printed Bibles, and that though there have been periods of no small extent, during which they could not obtain any Bibles printed in their own country, there never has been a time when they were prevented from availing themselves of the privilege of

* See Appendix.

importing Bibles from England, even when it was a hostile kingdom.

With regard to variety, we are aware that the Bible and the New Testament may be procured from the respondents in two or three forms, which were not to be seen in their warehouse sixteen years ago, when the Edinburgh Bible Society began its operations. But the most elegant Bible included in their list at the commencement of the present action, is not now to be procured from them, (a Bible of the size called eighteens)—not because the impression is exhausted, but because they sold the whole stock to Mr. Luinsden, a bookseller in Glasgow, who now, enjoying a monopoly of this size of Bible, has raised the price. All other booksellers in Scotland consider this a hardship, more especially as they are given to understand that it is not to be reprinted at all, and that its place is to be supplied by one of the less acceptable size of twenty-fours.

The variety, however, is of much less consequence than the accuracy. And here we do not mean to say that any of the printers of the Bible are invulnerable. If the patent has been granted for the purpose of securing accuracy, the object has never been attained, and least of all in Scotland. The assignees of the printer whose patent expired in 1798, printed a folio and a royal quarto Bible five years before they went out of office, and after more than thirty years elapsed, thousands of these Bibles remained unsold,—a proof that, for some reason or other, they were not much in demand. This very circumstance may have contributed, in some degree, to lower the price of the Bibles of the present patentees, and also to stimulate them to greater exertions.

But we cannot compliment them on the superior accuracy of their quarto Bibles. Mark and Charles Kerr published a respectable looking Bible in 1791, with the following among many other errors:—
 2 Sam. iii. 29, *on* for *or*; 2 Sam. xxiii. 39, the word *all* omitted; 1 Kings xxi. 15, *his* for *is*; 1 Kings xxii. 38, *the dogs liked for the dogs licked* ;* 2 Kings vi. 27, *the* for *thee*; Ezek. iii. 9, *be use* for *because*; Ezek. v. 9, *the forehead* for *thy forehead*; Psalm cxix. 35, *make me not to know* for *make me to know*. All this is very bad; but the quarto Bible of the present patentees, printed in 1808, does not appear to us, on a hasty glance, to be much better. We see, for instance, the following mistakes in five of the books:—Job vi. 30, *it* for *is*; Job xxiv. 8, *shelter* for *a shelter*; Daniel ii. 20, *hename* for *the name*; John v. 47, *shll* for *shall*; Acts vii. 31, *say* for *saw*; Acts xxii. 5, *both* for *doth*; 2 Cor. x. 11, *indeed* for *in deed*. Their quarto Bible, 1811, contains several egregious blunders, as *stone* for *storm*, *that* for *not*, &c. In their pocket Bible, 1816, besides other mistakes, we observe the following ungrammatical expression in Psalm lxvi. 14, “which my lips have uttered, and my mouth *have* spoken.” If we chose to dwell on this subject, we could easily show that we have too good cause for anxiety on the point of correctness.

To proceed, however, to the merits of the question of law, we beg leave to begin by observing, that the prerogative of the Crown, though said in page 3 of the answers to be a matter so clear that

* It might disturb the gravity even of well-disposed persons to hear that the dogs *liked* blood.

it was deliberately and expressly given up by the counsel for the booksellers, has never been admitted by us at all.

The question before the Court is said in page 4 to divide itself into two branches. 1. Has his Majesty, as king of Scotland, the right or prerogative of the exclusive printing of the Bible, prayer-books, &c; and of preventing the importation thereof from other countries? 2. Has he granted such exclusive rights to the respondents?

I. The first question is said to have been less enlarged on than it would have been in the case of the booksellers, from the thorough conviction which seemed to impress every one that the matter was too clear for argument or dispute. It is then said that the defenders are mistaken in saying that the numerous grants and licenses cited in the petition had not been discovered at the time of that hearing. "Every one of those documents, (it is said,) except two or three, which are quite insignificant, were produced in process during the course of that hearing."

With regard to this matter, we beg leave to say, that a complete series of grants and licenses was certainly not exhibited in the former process, so as to be in view of the Court; and if the whole of the grants, with the exception of two or three, were in the possession of the counsel for the respondents, the circumstance must have dropped out of their memories when they prepared their Appeal Case, as in that paper, page 5, after referring to the first patent granted to Chepman and Millar in 1507, they say, "The next patent extant, and the first which has been found in the record of the great

seal, where there are many omissions, is that to Robert Young and Evan Tyller, dated the 30th June, 1641. There appears from the preamble of this writ, to have been former patents granted, one to Robert Young solely in 1632, and one of a prior date to Thomas Finlawson, *neither of which has been discovered.*"

During the long period of one hundred and thirty-four years, intervening between the date of the grant to Chepmán and Millar in 1507, and that to Young and Tyler, we have referred to a series of more than twenty documents, which appear to us to be of great importance, and among the rest we have referred to two grants in favour of Thomas Finlawson, neither of which is by any means insignificant, —as we trust we shall be able to shew in the sequel of this paper.

Before we refer to these successive grants, it will be necessary to make a few observations on the statements contained in the 5th and 6th pages of the Answers.

It is there said, that on the first discovery of printing, it seems to have been generally held that a right of controlling the press existed in the crown, and that no person was entitled to print without a special licence to that effect. We do not know on what authority this is asserted. We rather understood that in most of the kingdoms of Europe, despotic as they were, the only restraints which were attempted to be imposed on the liberty of the press, at least during the first sixty years of the existence of the art of printing, proceeded entirely from the clergy, particularly from the Court of Inquisition, and from some of the universities. The council of

the Lateran in 1515, under Leo the X. required all books to be submitted to the revision of the Pope's vicar, or to the bishop and inquisitor of the city, and afterwards the council of Trent authorized a more extensive establishment of censors and inspectors of the press. It is needless, however, to inquire what was the state of things in this respect before the Reformation of religion in the 16th century, as the practice of these times of spiritual bondage can be no law to us. It was indeed a matter of great difficulty to obtain books relating to religion, or almost to any subject, in such a country as Scotland. Even when books were allowed to be printed, or brought into the country, they were not allowed to be read, except by certain privileged orders of persons ; and nothing is more certain than this, that whenever the civil power interfered, so as to limit the right of printing, it was at the instigation of the church, whose concern was not so much to secure the purity of religion, as to prevent the laity from speculating on articles of faith. When, for instance, the privy council in the reign of James IV. gave the sole privilege of printing books to Walter Chepman and Andro Millar, we know very well that the leading members of the privy council were churchmen, who filled also the highest offices of the state. Forman, bishop of Moray, was Lord Chancellor ; Beaton, abbot of Dunfermling, afterwards primate, was Lord High Treasurer ; the Abbot of Melrose was Secretary of State ; the Archdeacon of St. Andrews, afterwards Bishop of Aberdeen, was Lord Clerk Register ; and Elphinstone, Bishop of Aberdeen, who had formerly been Lord Chancellor, was now Lord

Keeper of the Privy Seal. This prelate was personally interested in the grant bestowed on Chepman and Millar. He was the author or compiler of all the books specified in the gift, which are supposed by the respondents to bear the closest analogy to the Bible, and the other books of devotion now in use. The Aberdeen Breviary, containing the offices of devotion after the Scottish use, with the legends of Scottish saints, is said in the body of the book itself, as well as in the letter of privilege, to have been the composition of “our traist counsalour, William, Bishop of Aberdeen,” assisted by others; and it is not much less certain, that the book of Chronicles, once intended to be printed by Chepman and Millar, was also the work of that eminent prelate. If the book had been printed, we know very well from the use which Hector Boece professes to have made of it, and from all the accounts of the manuscript itself, that it would have added very little to the amount of our historical knowledge, and that its affinity with the standards of the true faith, and the rituals of spiritual worship, would have been no greater than the communion of light with darkness. *

* The period of our history, from which the respondents draw the earliest example of a king of Scotland taking charge of the interests of religion, is certainly not the most favourable for the purpose. During the reign of James III. and James IV. according to the account of Spotswood, (Hist. p. 59, 60.) “All things in the church went daily from ill to worse. At court, benefices were sold, or then bestowed as rewards upon flatterers, and the ministers of unlawful pleasures; and in the church, canonical elections, especially in the monasteries, were quite abrogated. The king presenting abbots and priors unto the the Pope; none were refused that came with his recommendation. The monasteries which were founded for pious and charitable uses, came by little and little in the hands of secular men, who, having had

If after all it shall be deemed a matter of any consequence that the king's name was used in the letter of privilege, we trust it will not be forgotten that James IV. had been much courted by Pope Julius II. who by his legate declared the king of Scotland protector of the Christian religion. In this capacity James might venture to exercise a function which in those days was never considered to be included in the kingly prerogative. And as a farther proof that the authorising of books of religion either to be used or printed, was not supposed to belong to the king or the civil government in times of popery, we need only refer to the well known facts connected with the introduction of the book known by the title of Archbishop Hamilton's Catechism. This work was authorised by a provincial council, which met at Edinburgh in 1551, of which an account may be seen in Lord Hailes' Historical Memorials. The council authorised the printing of this work, but when it was printed, every precaution was used, as appears from the 16th canon, to prevent it from coming into the possession of secular persons; and though it was to be read to the people, all the copies not required for the use of the clergy were to be kept in strict custody by the archbishop himself. When it was printed, in the year 1552, it bears on the Colophon, that it was by the command and at the expense of the archbishop, and it bears no manner of trace of

their education in the court, brought with them from thence the manners thereof, shaking off all care of discipline, and neglecting the duties of hospitality.—The whole ecclesiastic state became also infected, ignorance and impiety every where prevailing; till in the end, the laity putting their hands to the work, made that violent and disorderly reformation, wherof in the next book we shall hear."

licence from the king or any secular power. The authority under which it was promulgated is more clearly described in the title—“ The Catechisme, &c. set furth be the maist reverend father in God Johne Archbischop of Sanct Androus Legat nait and primat of the kirk of Scotland, in his provincial counsall haldin at Edinburgh the xxvi. day of Januarie, the zeir of our Lord 1551, with the advice and counsale of the bischoippis and uthir prelates, with doctours of theologie and canon law of the said realme of Scotland present for the tyme.” This book was published subsequently to the act 1551, against printing without licence ; but, though other works by the same printer were published *cum privilegio regali*, it is notorious that the books of almost every Scottish author of that period, on the subject of religion, were printed abroad, and then imported into Scotland.

It is said in page 5 of the answers, that “ Henry VII. and Henry VIII. (before the latter pretended to be head of the church) were perpetually issuing licences to allow certain books to be printed, and prohibitions against others, and all the books printed in those days bear on the title-pages to have been printed *cum privilegio regali*. It is well known how strictly the Star Chamber enforced these pretensions.”

We cannot help shuddering at the inauspicious mention of a court which Hume has pronounced to have been one of the most illegal and despotic tribunals ever known in any of the most absolute governments of Europe. But it is a new thing to us to be told of the perpetual licences of Henry VII. and Henry VIII. before the latter pretended to be head

of the English church. The numerous works printed by William Caxton bear no trace of any royal licence. “ The first printers (says the late Sir Ilay Campbell in a very able paper on the subject of Literary Property,) carried on their business as a lawful employment without any patent or licence. Caxton’s title-pages never bear *cum privilegio*, but only these humble words “ Imprinted by me, simple man William Caxton.” Though Caxton was patronised and befriended by Edward IV. no one has ever pretended to find the title of king’s printer earlier than 1504, when it seems to have been granted to William Fanque. Wynkyn de Worde is generally allowed to have possessed the title in 1509. But be it remembered that this honourable distinction neither restrained other printers from printing books, nor prevented the importation of foreign books. The act 1 Rich. III. c. 9. gave a right to *strangers* to bring in printed or written books for sale, and to exercise the art of printing in England. This liberty was restrained for the first time by the act of the 25th Hen. VIII. c. 15. which imposed a fine of six shillings and eight pence, to be paid for every bound book brought from any parts out of the king’s obeisance. By the same act it was provided, that the prices of books were to be regulated by any two of the great officers, so that booksellers and printers were not to enhance the prices at their own discretion. This act was passed about the time of the king’s final breach with Rome, and fully three years after he had been recognised as sole protector and supreme head of the church, by the clergy assembled in their convocations, who at the same time paid a

fine of more than L.100,000 to obtain a pardon for the offence of having submitted to the legatine authority of Cardinal Wolsey. It was in the year 1534 that the Parliament declared the king to be supreme head of the Church of England, and to have power to visit, order, and correct by spiritual authority. And it is undeniable that Henry VIII. never issued any licence *for printing the Bible*, or gave any order concerning it till after he had claimed the title of head of the church.

In the year 1530, according to Wake, (*State of the Church*, page 473,) the king conferred with the bishops concerning the scriptures, and gave order for a translation of the New Testament. It is said, that in the following year, 1531, (after the submission of the clergy,) he ordered a Bible of the largest volume to be had in every church. Three years afterwards, the debates of the convocation (says Wake, page 587) ended in a petition to the king, that he would direct a translation to be made of the scriptures into the vulgar tongue, and that he would command that none of his subjects should dispute about the catholic faith. Here we may take notice of a very material point in the constitution of the church of England, according to Archbishop Wake. The clergy in convocation may treat about *ecclesiastical matters*; but they must neither *treat*, nor *resolve to make any canons, constitutions, or ordinances provincial*, without the *king's authority*.

At the time, however, when this order is said to have been given, not one of our historians has ever been able to refer to any translation of the Bible which was completely printed. All that is known for certain is, that in 1530, the New Testament of

Tindale was ordered to be called in, and a new one was promised ; but if such a Bible was furnished, neither Burnet nor any other writer has been able to discover by whom it was translated. In fact, the Bible was never printed entirely till the year 1535, when the translation of Myles Coverdale was published, and this, like all the previous editions of the New Testament, and other parts of the Bible, was printed on the Continent. From the dedication to the King, as chief head of the church of England, this edition is supposed to have been allowed by the royal authority. About a year after this Bible was published, an injunction was given out by Lord Cromwell, Privy Seal, Vicegerent to the King's highness for all his jurisdiction ecclesiastical, requiring every one of the clergy to set up a copy of the whole Bible in the church, and to exhort every person to read the same. After this, several editions were set forth *with the king's most gracious licence* ; as two or three by James Nicolson in Southwark, in 1537 and 1538, one by Richard Grafton and Edward Whitchurch, 1538, (*cum gratia et privilegio regis*,) and a New Testament by Robert Redman in Fleet Street, 1538. About this time Grafton complained of the importation of Bibles from Holland, and applied for the privilege of the sole printing of the Bible for three years. Grafton and Whitchurch procured the king's letters to the king of France for the liberty of printing a Bible at Paris. The royal license was granted, but before the impression was finished, the printers were carried before the inquisition under a charge of heresy, and the copies, amounting to 2500, were seized and confiscated. Part of the im-

pression was saved, and the types, presses, and workmen were, through the good management of Lord Cromwell, brought over to England; where the *Great Bible* was finished in the year 1539. In the course of that year, Henry the VIII. issued letters patent, addressed to all the printers and sellers of books within the realm, specially charging that no person shall attempt to print any Bible in English during the five years next ensuing, but only such as shall be deputed, assigned, and admitted by the Lord Cromwell. The attainder and execution of Cromwell in 1540, gave a severe check to the progress of the reformation. Several editions of the Bible were printed in 1539 and 1540, one by Edward Whitchurch, another by Thomas Petyt and Robert Redman, for Thomas Berthelet printer to the king's grace; a third by John Byddel, besides the Great Bible of Cranmer, in 1539, which bears the names both of Grafton and Whitchurch. But from the year 1541, though small parts of the Bible were printed at London by Day, Seres, Hyll, Powell, Herford, Oswan, Jugge, and others, no complete edition was published again till the year 1549. In the short reign of Edward VI. the Bible was printed in whole or part by more than twenty different printers, so that it is evident that no man enjoyed permanently an exclusive privilege.

In page 5, it is said, that as soon as the introduction of printing became so general as to excite notice, the case in Scotland was the same as in England; that is to say, a royal privilege was required. The act 1551, cap. 27, entitled *Prenters suld prent nathing without licence*, is then referred

to. This statute, according to Sir Ilay Campbell, was the first restraint on the liberty of the press in Scotland ; and he observes, that “ this was entirely agreeable to the spirit of the established religion in those times, averse to free enquiry, and having no other means left of opposing the reformation, than by obstructing the progress of knowledge and true literature, then fast gaining ground by means of the invention of printing.”* This eminent lawyer, without subscribing to Sir George Mackenzie’s opinion, that printing is *inter regalia*, appears to have thought that the power of restraining the press was acknowledged to be rather in the parliament than in the sovereign ; and, with regard to the act 1540, requiring the clerk register to appoint a printer to print the acts who must have also the sovereign’s special licence thereto, he observes, “ that the exclusive privilege even of printing the acts of parliament was limited to six years, and that the authority of parliament was thought necessary to confer this monopoly. At that time, (he observes farther,) it was the custom, in the more absolute governments, to apply for the exclusive privilege of publishing the works of ancient authors, when manuscripts had been searched out and collected at a great expense ; and sometimes such privileges were obtained from several potentates at once. But it deserves to be remarked, (he adds,) that these *privilegia* never were perpetual, but always granted for a limited number of years ; sometimes seven, sometimes ten, and seldom if ever exceeding twenty years.”

* Information for Alexander Donaldson, against John Hinton, bookseller in London, and Alexander M’Conochie writer in Edinburgh, his Attorney, Jan. 2, 1773, p. 28.

The act 1551 evidently applied to all kind of books, but rather to such as were profane than to such as could be called sacred. But it must not be overlooked, that it applied only to the *printing* of books, and that it did not provide against their *importation*. Assuredly it did not repeal the act 1542, authorizing the reading of the Bible,—an act, the benefit of which could not be enjoyed by the people of Scotland, otherwise than by the importation of the copies.

We cannot perceive how the act 1551 could avail the respondents, even if it were in full force, unless they could show that its object was to prevent all printers except one to publish or to sell any book. A royal *licence to print a book*, and an *exclusive right* to print and to sell, are very different things.

Who will now venture to say that printing is *inter regalia*? We do not believe that any one lawyer in England or Scotland has ventured to avow such an opinion for more than 120 years.

If the act 1551 be worth any thing, it must restrain all those who have not the royal licence, from printing ony buikes, ballads, sangs, blasphemations, rimes or tragedies, alsweill of kirkmen as temporal, outher in Latine or English tongue; and as his Majesty's printers are the only persons who possess a royal licence, they must no doubt be entitled to the sole privilege of printing ballads and blasphemations, and all the other books.

The testimony of Sir George Mackenzie, with regard to the allowance given to “his own printer only to print Bibles and other school books,” does not appear to us to be of much value, not only because he refers to the act 25, parl. 11, James VI. *against the sellers of erroneous books*, as if this for-

tified his opinion, whereas it prevents the importation only of such books as are against the true word of God, but chiefly because the law of Scotland, in the time of Sir George Mackenzie, was in various respects very different from what it is now.

In his time the king was, by virtue of several acts of parliament, understood to possess a number of powers which were withdrawn after the revolution. Thus the act parl. 1. Charles II. c. 11, "for taking the oath of allegiance, and asserting the royal prerogative," is substantially disclaimed in the declaration of the estates, or claim of right, April 11, 1689, requiring the abrogation of the former oath of allegiance, and all other oaths and declamations. It is well known that the third act of the first parliament of Queen Anne, declares that it shall be high treason to endeavour to alter or innovate the claim of right, or any article thereof; and it is equally well known, that the second act of the first parliament of William and Mary, introduced the very form of oath with which the claim of right concludes, and rescinded all other oaths of allegiance or supremacy, declarations and tests. A similar act of parl. 1. James VI. cap. 17, was rescinded by William and Mary, parl. 1. sess. 2. cap. 28. So also the act parl. 2. Charles II. cap. 1, Nov. 16, 1669, "asserting his majesty's supremacy over all persons, and in all causes ecclesiastical," was rescinded by parl. 1. William and Mary, sess. 2. act 1. April 25, 1690, and declared to be in *the whole heads, articles, and clauses thereof, to be of no force or effect in all time coming*.* Let us here consider what were the articles of this act:—they were these,—"that his majesty hath the supreme authority and supre-

* See Appendix, No. I.

macy over all persons, and *in causes ecclesiastical* ; and that by virtue thereof, the *ordering and disposing of the external government of the church* doth belong to his majesty and his successors, as *an inherent right* of the crown ; and that his majesty and his successors may *alter, enact, and emit such constitutions, acts, and orders*, concerning the *administration* of the *external government* of the *church*, and the *persons employed in the same*, and concerning all *ecclesiastical meetings*, and *matters* to be *proposed* and *determined* therein, as they in their royal wisdom shall think fit ; which acts, orders, and constitutions being *recorded in the books of counsel*, and duly published, are to be observed and obeyed by all his Majesty's subjects—likeas his Majesty doth rescind and annul all laws, acts, and clauses thereof, and all customs and constitutions, civil or ecclesiastical, which are contrary to, or inconsistent with his Majesty's supremacy.” This was law in the time of Sir George Mackenzie ; but it is not now the law of Scotland, having been utterly abolished by the act 25th April 1690, which, it must be observed, is subsequent in date to the act abolishing prelacy ; and thus the whole force of the reasoning of the respondents, p. 32 and 33, with regard to the import of the word *allanerly*, is entirely annihilated. But farther, it appears to us very material to observe, that in Sir George Mackenzie's time it was considered as law, that his Majesty having in his hands the whole ordering and disposal of trade with foreign nations as an undoubted privilege and prerogative of the crown, might *prohibit the importation of foreign commodities* if he thought fit, or might lay on them such impositions and restraints as he pleased.

Thus, in the language of the claim of right, had a *legal limited monarchy* been altered to an *arbitrary despotic power*. This was done in the time of Sir George Mackenzie ; but we have the happiness of knowing that this act, asserting his Majesty's prerogative in the ordering and disposal of trade with foreigners, was rescinded by King William's first parliament, and declared to be void and null in all time coming.*

In page 6, it is said, “that the sole and exclusive right of *printing all books whatever*, and, of course, of preventing importation from other countries, was vested in the crown, and that no one could print or

* About the same time with Sir G. Mackenzie's observations, appeared a work entitled “*Scotia Indiculum*; or the Present State of Scotland, by A. Mudie, printed at London, 1682.” The author, following the plan of Chamberlayne in his “*Angliae Notitia*, or the Present State of England,” describes, in his second chapter, the power and prerogatives of the king in very high terms, saying, that “the king is an *absolute* and *unaccountable* monarch—that he is defender of the faith—that the prerogatives of the crown are great, as power of peace, and war, &c.” and then he proceeds, in a new paragraph, to which is prefixed the words *Church Government*: “But to these, since his Majesty's happy restoration, great additions have been made. In the reign of King James the Sixth, the power of General Assemblies was raised very high by law, which occasioned the sad disaster in the church, and laid a foundation to all the late troubles of the state, notwithstanding the supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs was always in the crown, since the Reformation. Yet it was pretended as contrary to law, for the king to introduce any thing into the church without the consent of the General Assembly: it was, therefore, enacted in Parliament, Act 1, 2d Parl. held by the Duke of Lauderdale: That the external government and polity of the church was wholly in the king's power; and that his orders sent to the Privy Council, and published by them about all ecclesiastical matters, meetings, and persons, were to be obeyed by his subjects, any law or practice to the contrary notwithstanding: so that in all matters that relate to the church government, the king's power is absolute.” The author then goes on to state, almost in the words of Chamberlayne, various respects in which the king's prerogative is exercised in ecclesiastical matters. He only hath

import without a special licence from the crown. This (they say) is founded on clear statutory enactment. The *progress of time, and more just notions of constitutional law*, have made this right fall into desuetude in regard to all other books ; but in regard to the Bible, *and other privileged books*, the statute law has been retained, and even confirmed, and strengthened by the most constant and uninterrupted consuetude that can possibly exist in any branch of the law."

the patronage of all bishopricks, he is the nursing father of the church, &c. and, after saying that there still remained a shadow of the General Assemblies which in King James's time had the supreme authority about all church matters, he adds, " nothing is to be proposed but by the king or his commissioner, nor can any thing that they do be of force till it be ratified by the king ; *but of this synod there is no need, seeing the king's supremacy is so large, it is evident that the king is over all persons, as well in ecclesiastics, as civil, supreme.*" The whole of this statement is copied from Middleton's Appendix to Spotiswood's History, printed at London 1677. Yet neither Middleton nor Mudie ventured to transcribe all that was said by the English writer, who thus concludes the corresponding paragraph in his work. " The king hath power to call a national or provincial synod, and by commissioners, or by his metropolitans in their several jurisdictions, to make *canons, orders, ordinances, and constitutions*, to introduce into the church what *ceremonies* he shall think fit ; reform and correct all *heresies, schisms, punish contempts, &c.* and therein, or thereby, to declare what *doctrines* in the church are fit to be *published or professed, what translation of the Bible to be allowed, what books of the Bible are canonical, and what apocryphal, &c.*" Chamberlayne applies other extravagant titles to the king, calling him " *pontifex maximus, and supreme pastor of England, having not only right of ecclesiastical government, but also of exercising ecclesiastical function, &c.*" (p. 128, edit. 4, 1670—p. 77, edit. 16, 1687.)

Granting that the account of the prerogative of the king of Scotland, in the reign of Charles II. has been correctly given by Mudie, no man will now be bold enough to say that, by the law of Scotland, the king can either originate or conclude any ecclesiastical statute,—or that he has any power to introduce ceremonies, or to prescribe forms of worship, or that none of the acts of the church are of force till they are ratified by his Majesty. The king never so much as claims the power of ratifying the laws of the church ; and it would be a violation of the constitution if he were to attempt to exercise such a power. The Con-

Even granting this last statement to be true, we would fearlessly maintain that the consuetude of *importing* books, and particularly *Bibles*, has been at least as constant as that of printing them at a privileged press. We assert that this consuetude of importing Bibles has been much more constant than the other,—for there have been periods, sometimes of long duration, when the Bible could not be procured in Scotland, in any other way than by importing it; and there has been no time when any variety of editions could be had otherwise than by importation. From the year 1542 till the year 1579, no Bibles could be had in Scotland but such as were imported. From 1579 till 1633, no Bibles could be had in Scotland, without importing them, except two editions, both of a folio size, and of the Geneva translation. From 1633 till 1649, no Bibles, of a large size, were printed in Scotland, but many were imported. From 1649 till 1671,

fession of Faith has been ratified by the state, but this was done not by Royal proclamation, or by an order in Council, but by an act of Parliament, 7th June, 1690, and 12th June, 1693, on which last occasion it is ordained, that uniformity of worship, and of the administration of all public ordinances within this church, be observed by all ministers and preachers, as the same are at present performed and allowed therein, or shall be *hereafter declared by the authority of the same.*"

Every Sovereign of Great Britain at his or her accession swears to maintain and preserve inviolably the foresaid settlement of the true Protestant religion, with the government, discipline, worship, rights and privileges of this church, as established by the laws of this kingdom, in prosecution of the *Claim of Right*. In the *Claim of Right* it was declared by the estates of Scotland, "That prelacy, and the superiority of any office in the church above presbyters, is, and hath been a great and insupportable grievance and trouble to this nation, and contrary to the inclination of the generality of the people ever since the Reformation; (they having reformed from Popery by Presbyters) and, therefore, ought to be abolished."

If the king be in any sense the Head of the Church, he must hold an office in the church above Presbyters.

no Bibles were printed in Scotland by any King's printer,—and both before and after 1671, during the arbitrary government of Charles II. and James VII. not only were New Testaments printed by a great number of printers, but in spite of the exorbitant terms of Anderson's grant, Bibles were allowed to be imported, of every letter or size, at least different from those which were furnished by the King's printer. Is it possible that it shall be said that though importation was allowed in those times, and has continued ever since, the King may now exercise the power of prohibiting importation, unless for the sake of consistency it shall also be said, that in spite of all *just notions of constitutional law*, his Majesty may also resume the exclusive right of printing all books whatever, and unless *bookselling*, as well as *printing*, be *inter regalia*?

But we say further, that the *consuetude* has not been *uninterrupted in regard to the Bible*, and other *privileged books*, as they are called. Even in Anderson's time the New Testament was printed by many printers who had no special licence. It appears, from an act of the Privy Council, Feb. 9, 1671, that many printers were accustomed to print parts of the Bible. We have seen various New Testaments by Watson, before he was King's printer. During the whole period of the gifts to Freebairn, Basket, and Watson, we know that the New Testament was frequently printed at Glasgow and elsewhere, though we cannot point out more than one edition by Alexander Carmichael and Alexander Millar, 1737, and another by John Robertson and Mrs. M'Lean, 1748. One edition by James Watson, in Craig's close, Edinburgh, 1706, is superior to any which was ever published by the person who then held the patent; and ano-

ther good one was printed by Ruddiman in 1725. With regard to the Confession of Faith, the Catechisms, and the Metrical Psalms, we are sure that they were much less frequently printed by the King's printer than by others, till Sir D. Hunter Blair and Mr. Bruce came into office. We can produce more than seventy editions of the Confession of Faith, between the years 1650 and 1785, many of them very excellent, and almost all of them equal or superior to any which have yet been printed by the present patentees, and yet not one of them was printed by a King's printer. Some of these editions are used by presbyteries, when members sign the formula.* We defy the respondents to point out one tenth of the number of good editions printed by all their predecessors in office. The Catechism is a book which happens not to be very carefully preserved,—but we can point out three dozen of editions printed at Glasgow and Edinburgh, not by any King's printer. It is still more universally known that the Psalms in metre were printed by all and sundry till the year 1799, when the respondents began to print Bibles. We can produce 125 editions by private printers. In some of the pocket Bibles of 1799, we see Psalms printed at Edinburgh by *D. Schaw & Co.* for James Gillies, Glasgow; and whether they were dearer or cheaper we do not know, but they appear to be much finer than the Psalms printed the same year by his Majesty's printers. We know that several copies of the Psalms, printed by persons who had no patent, are used at this moment in the established Churches of this city, both in the pulpits and the precentors' desks. Some of the editions to which

* See Appendix.

we allude were printed by James Dickson, printer to the church of Scotland, who also continued, as long as he held that office, to print the Translations and Paraphrases from Scripture, which are as much used in worship as the Psalms. This collection was set forth in 1781, by authority of the General Assembly, which gave the printer to the Church the exclusive privilege of printing it for five years, and afterwards repeatedly extended this term, till at last, in 1795, it was prolonged for fourteen years, so that it must have expired, if we are not mistaken, in 1809. Long before that time the King's printer began to print the *Translations* and *Paraphrases*, and the printer for the Church discontinued the practice; though we understand that W. & J. Deas, as assignees to the late Mr. Dickson, printed them as lately as the year 1808. It has been currently said among booksellers, and we know it to be a fact, that his Majesty's printers have made an annual allowance to the printer for the Church to induce him to relinquish his claim. The Church has been no party to the bargain, and the public has not been a party,—so that neither the Church nor the public can be defrauded of their rights by a clandestine transaction. If the patentees had been convinced that whatever books are used in public worship, or even in private devotion, are comprehended in their gift, or that the king has at any time a right to dispose of the printing of such books, they might have saved themselves this expense. But without dwelling longer on this part of the question at present, we peremptorily challenge the respondents to prove the uninterrupted consuetude which they say has been established with regard to all privileged books. The New Testament, a most essential part of the Bible—the Psalms, and the Proverbs, also very important parts of it—the

Confession of Faith—the Catechisms, larger and shorter, were printed in Scotland by many different printers before Anderson's patent commenced in 1671, and during the whole time of its continuance till 1712, and likewise during the whole time of the subsequent patent or patents which expired in 1757. The Psalms, the book of Proverbs, the Confession of Faith, and the Catechisms, were printed during the whole period of Kincaid's patent by many other printers. And in Kincaid's time, the books called Apocrypha were often printed by Colin Macfarquhar and others. We do not consider these books as forming a part of the sacred canon, or as possessing any authority in matters of faith ; but we believe they are understood to be included in the grant to his Majesty's printers, at least in England, where, to a certain extent, these books are used in the service of the church. And we cannot help adding, that many Bibles have been printed in Scotland till within the last forty years, some containing Ostervald's notes, and others containing the notes of anonymous authors ; and notwithstanding the interdicts granted against the sale of such Bibles, when they have not been printed by the King's printers, we do not know that the law of the case has yet been settled, and as little do we know any good reason for allowing the king's printers, for their private emolument, to print notes and commentaries possessing no authority whatever, or even contradicting the standards of the national church. And we will remind them farther, that several translations of the Bible into English have been printed in Scotland since the commencement of their patent ; for instance, one edition of the Douay Bible, in five volumes, printed at Edinburgh by John

Moir in 1805, and at least two editions of a translation by Dr. David Macrae, both at Glasgow, one in 1799, and another in 1815. If the propagation of error be what is feared, if the printing of the Bible were thrown open, this evil may result as effectually from the publication of new translations, as from the indiscriminate liberty of printing an old one; and the evil will not be averted, if, in order to entitle any man to print a new edition of the version in general use, care shall only be taken to annex notes or illustrations, orthodox or heterodox, of sufficient length to occupy a greater space than the text.

We now proceed to take some notice of the various grants and licences to which we formerly referred, and concerning most of which, the respondents appear to us to entertain a very erroneous opinion.

On the case of Chepman and Millar, we think it unnecessary to say more than that the licence in their favour was evidently intended to secure them against loss in the prosecution of an undertaking which was new and somewhat hazardous. It is not pretended that the religion of the people would be contaminated by the importation of books of Salisbury use into the church of Scotland, which had borrowed from the constitutions of Sarum the entire model of the canons by which it continued to be governed, from the time of the provincial council of Perth in 1242, down to the establishment of the reformation. But it is easy to perceive how antipathy to every thing English might at that period conspire with the prevailing horror at every practice which had the effect of carrying the coin

out of the kingdom, so as to determine the king and his council to try the experiment of supplying the lieges with books for the service of the church, and the purposes of education, as well as of amusement. The experiment did not succeed. Few as were the books at that time required in Scotland, the king's printer could not supply them. They might furnish the necessary number of copies of Donat and one or two other grammatical works for the eldest sons of barons and freeholders, who were in that reign required to be put to the grammar schools and the schools of art and jure. But from the year 1512 to the year 1536, all the writers of this nation whose names have descended to our time, certainly did take or send the copies of their books “ furth of the realm to ger imprent the samyne in utheris countreis, to be brocht and sauld again within the realm,” and this without having incurred any penalty of which any record can be discovered.* Well do we know that “ no transla-

* Not long after the date of Chepman and Millar's grant, a number of books written by Scottish authors were printed on the continent; and of most of these books, a much greater number of copies may now be found in this country than of any of the works of the first king's printers. We are pretty sure that there is not more than one complete copy of the Aberdeen Breviary in Scotland; and we have never heard of a complete copy of any other book printed by Chepman. But not to mention such writers as Alexander Aless, who early embraced the reformed religion, we could easily produce copies of the works of David Cranstoun, George Lockert, Hector Boece, John Mair, William Manderston, Adam Elder, Patrick Cockburn, John Rutherford, Henry Scrimger, John Vaus, Edward Henryson, Florence Wilson, and several others, all printed in France, within forty years after the date of the first patent, and most of them dedicated to Scottish statesmen or dignitaries of the Scottish church; so that we are quite sure that there was nothing surreptitious in this mode of publishing and importing them. Some of these works were

tion of the Bible was at the period of the grant permitted to be either printed or read.” This admitted fact is sufficient to show how absurd it is to seek, in a period of such utter darkness, for the foundation of a right of the crown, said to be vested in it for the conservation of the purity of the true religion.

We next refer to the case of Thomas Davison, who, though honoured by the title of His Majesty’s Printer, derived his right to print the statutes, not from the king, but from the parliament. But as he printed no Bibles, any more than Chepman and Millar, because, at the date of his grant, the Bible, though translated, was not allowed to be read in the vulgar tongue—we need not dwell on this case, though perhaps it may not be amiss to observe, that if, (as the respondents have said, p. 8.) “it is very material to remark, that the books specially enumerated in the grant (in favour of Chepman and Millar,) besides the laws and acts of parliament, are *the religious books then in use, viz.* Chronicles, Mass Books, Manuals, Matyne Books, with additions and legends of Scottis Sancts, which certainly bear a strong analogy to the Bibles, Psalm

grammatical and were used in the schools (as the well-known work of Vaus) others related to the higher branches of liberal study, and were used in universities, as the writings of Cranstoun, Lockhart, Manderston and Rutherford—others were theological, as the books of Wilson, Elder, Cockburn, and the numerous volumes of Mair, which went through a rapid succession of editions; one or two related to subjects of law, as the books of Scrimger, and several were of the nature of *Chronicles*, particularly the History of Hector Boece. Two of the individuals here mentioned were appointed by Elphinstone to professorships in the university which he founded at Aberdeen; and it is not likely that such men would have violated a law which was understood to prevent the importation of books.

Books and Prayer Books, the religious books now in use, specified in the patent of the pursuers ;” it was rather unfortunate that it did not occur to Thomas Davison, that the Bible authorised to be introduced into Scotland in 1542, when he was king’s printer, was much more unequivocally a religious book than the Chronicles, which he printed without discovering that they had any claim to the character of sacred books ; and accordingly that the regent, instead of applying to Sir Ralph Sadler to send to England for copies of the Bible, ought to have employed Davison to print the Bible,—a task which no man who has seen his works can for a moment hesitate to say that he would have executed as well as Richard Grafton, or Edward Whitechurch, or John Biddel, or Thomas Barthelet, or any one of more than a dozen of printers who at that time printed Bibles in England.

The gifts in favour of the printers who succeeded Davison might require more particular notice, but we must be brief.

The licence to Robert Lekprevik, dated Jan. 14, 1567, gives him authority to print for twenty years, not only the laws, “ but all sic godlie works and volumis as tends to the glorie of God”—but it must be observed that, with the exception of the Psalms, the Homilies and Catechisms, none of the books were intended for the service of religion, but were either law books or histories, or grammars for the use of schools.

The respondents say, (p. 8. and 9.) that in considering Lekprevik’s gift, we have mixed up a totally different matter, namely, the leave granted to all the people of Scotland to read the Bible in the

vulgar tongue, by the parliament 1542-3. We mentioned this fact to show, that when the people of Scotland were first supplied with Bibles, it was *by importation* from England, and that the practice of importing Bibles must undoubtedly have continued through all the period which intervened from 1542 till the first Edinburgh edition was printed long after the date of Lekprevik's grant, though in that interval many books of great size were printed in Scotland. The respondents seem to have doubts with regard to the passing of the act, —a fact scarcely ever doubted before. It is mentioned by Sir Ralph Sadler, in his letter to the king of England, (March 20, 1543,) who says, that open proclamations are made, “ That it shall be lawful to all men to read the Bible and Testament in the mother tongue.” It was a fact which Keith was not very likely to have recorded without the strongest evidence ; and it is mentioned expressly by Knox, who says, that “ the Commissioniers of Burghis and a pairt of the nobilitie,” required the enactment to be made, but that the clergy did not yield till they were “ convicted be reasonis and be multitude of votis in thair contrair—and so by act of parliament it was maid free to all men and women to reid the scriptures in thair awin tongue, or in the Ingliche tongue.” The respondents then proceed to say, that “ the clergy, and especially Cardinal Beaton, prevailed with the regent to discountenance the circulation of Bibles by the most severe measures ; and accordingly they add, there were *very few copies* introduced into Scotland till the Reformation was finally completed.”

How do the respondents know this? The regent, indeed, acted a perfidious and illegal part, and by his connivance severities were inflicted on persons who were accused of “disputing about the scriptures,”—but that the Bible was imported and read to a great extent, we are assured by the most direct and unimpeachable testimony. Knox says—“This (the freedom of reading the scriptures) was na small victorie of Christ Jesus, fechting agains the conjured enemies of his veritie; not small comfort to sic as befoir war haldin in sic bondage, that they durst not have red the Lord’s prayer, the ten commandmentis, nor articles of their faith in the Inglische tongue, bot they sould have been accused of heresie. *Then mycht have been seen the Bybill lying upon almaist every gentlemannis table. The New Testament was born about in mony menis hands.* Then war set furth warkis in our awin tongue, besydes them that cum from England, that did disclois the pryd, the craft, the tyrannie and abuiss of the Roman antichrist.” (Knox’s Hist. p. 34. Edin. 1732.

A more direct testimony may be produced to prove how extensively the scriptures were read in Scotland before any edition of them was printed in this country. In the Dedication of the first edition of the Bible, published at Edinburgh in 1579, the General Assembly thus addresses the king:—“Certainlie we have great occasion baith to glorifie the gudenes of God toward this countrie, and also heichlie to extol your Heines most godlie purpose and enterprise. O quhat difference may be seen between thir dayes of light, *when almaist in every private house the buike of God’s law is red and un-*

derstand in our vulgarie language, and that age of darknes when skarcelie in ane haill citie (without the clostres of monks and freires) culd the buke of God anes be founde, and that in ane strange tongue of Latin not gud but mixed with barbaritie, used and red be fewe, and almaist understand or exponit be nane ; and quhen the false namit clergie of this realme abusing the gentle nature of your Hienes maist noble gudshir of worthie memorie made it an capital crime to be punished with the fyre to have or read the New Testament in the vulgar language.”

The time to which they refer (that of his “ Hienes maist noble gudshir” James V.) preceded the period when the act allowing the scriptures to be read was passed ; but it is quite clear from the expressions of the church in this dedication (dated July 10, 1579,) that the Bible was already to be found *almaist in every private house*, and that the impression then published was intended chiefly “ to the end, that in every paroch kirk there suld be at least ane thereof kepit, to be callit the common buke of the kirke, as a maist meet ornament for sik a place and a perpetual register of the word of God the fountaine of all true doctrine, to be made patent to all the people of everie congregation as the only richt rule to direct and govern them in matters of religion, as also to confirm thame in the trueth receavit, and to reform and redress corruptions whensoever they may crepe in.”

There is no doubt that Lekprevik’s grant, dated January 14, 1567, prohibits the importation of all the books which he was then authorised to print. But the next grant to him, dated three months af-

terwards, *does not prohibit* the importation of “ the Inglis Bible imprentit of before at Geneva,” to which this licence (of April 14, 1568) applied. We repeat that this is a circumstance of great importance, and we also repeat, that Lekprevik never made use of his privilege of printing the Bible. The respondents demand our authority for this averment. We think it sufficient to refer again to the Dedication of the edition of 1579, from which it is quite manifest, that there had been no previous edition in Scotland. They then allege that such importation as took place in Lekprevik’s time must have been carried on under a licence from him. According to one of their doctrines (maintained in the action against the booksellers) none but such editions as are printed within the kingdom can be regarded as authentic ; and surely the licence of a printer cannot render foreign editions authentic, if they are not so before they are imported. But how is it probable that Lekprevik ever granted any such licence?—So long as the act of parliament 1542 was in force, all men must have been entitled to import Bibles ; and no grant under the privy seal could have taken away a privilege enjoyed by the people in virtue of an act of the legislature. If a licence had been necessary to warrant importation, it might have been in the power of an officer appointed by the king to frustrate the intention of the parliament in authorising the universal use of Bibles.

We might next mention a licence by no means of insignificant value, granted to Mr. George Young, to print a grammar, dated February 2, 1575. This grammar was compiled by several of the most

eminent scholars, under the direction of the privy council, and was ordered to be universally used throughout the realm.* An exclusive privilege of printing it was granted for ten years, and importation was prohibited ; but though the king and council exercised at that time a power which the government of Scotland does not now possess, of ordering what books shall be used in all schools, it is clear that the perpetual monopoly of this particular book was not contemplated, though it was compiled by the order, and at the expense of the crown.

The next licence to which we advert, is one granted to Alexander Arbuthnot and Thomas Bassandyne to print Bibles, (dated June 30, 1576.) This licence prohibited importation for ten years, provided the Bibles were sold at the prices appointed, viz. 4 lib. 14s. and 4d. Scottish money for each copy. Before, however, the Bible was published, Bassandyne died, and a new licence was granted to Arbuthnot, who was then made king's printer, August 24, 1579, by which time the Bible was completely printed. It must be observed that Lekprevik's licence to print the Bible, and his privilege as king's printer did not expire till the year 1588. The second licence to Arbuthnot prohibited the printing of the Bible by any other person in Scotland for ten years, that is, till August 1589. But *importation* was *not prohibited*, as it had been in the licence to Arbuthnot and Bassandyne, June 1576, or as it was in the licence for printing the Psalm Book, granted to Arbuthnot in April 1579.

* See the Order of Council in Appendix LVI.

The respondents have undertaken to correct our statements with regard to the edition of the Bible to which the licences now mentioned have always been understood to refer. They state very decidedly, that the Bible undertaken to be printed by Arbuthnot and Bassandyne, *was not the Geneva Bible*, but a *new translation*, executed under the auspices of, and authorised by the General Assembly itself. In proof of this assertion, they refer to one authority, that of Mr. Robert Wodrow, whose testimony by his own account must be of very little value, “*as he had not seen either the Geneva Bible, or that published by Arbuthnot and Bassandyne.*”

We are not in the same predicament with the single witness for the respondents; for we have seen and read *the Geneva Bible*, and we have also seen and read the Bible published by *Arbuthnot and Bassandyne*; and in opposition to the mere imagination of Mr. Wodrow, who owns that *he may be mistaken*, we do positively maintain that the Bible published by Arbuthnot and Bassandyne is *verbatim* a Bible of the Geneva translation, with all the Geneva notes. The only peculiarities of the edition (besides the dedication) were the calendar, and a few chronological notices, both furnished by Mr. Robert Pont, then one of the ministers of the West Kirk, and at the same time a Lord of Session. Every one who has compared this Edinburgh Bible with the best edition of the Geneva can prove their absolute identity. The second edition of the Bible printed at Geneva in 1561, contains a few errors,*

* As Mat. v. 3. Blessed are the *place-makers* for *peace-makers*.

which are not in the first edition (of 1560,) and which have been avoided in the Edinburgh edition. But even the second Geneva edition is superior in one respect to the Edinburgh edition, in having the supplied words carefully distinguished by being included in brackets, which Bassandyne did not begin to use till he had printed off the four Gospels, where he employs no device whatever for indicating such words as are not in the original. The wooden cuts introduced into several parts of the Old Testament are fac similes of the cuts in the Geneva Bible, and in the maps the French words *orient, occident, aquilon, midi, &c.* are all retained.

Not a single word has been said by Calderwood, or by any original authority, to lead us to suppose that a new translation was at this time intended, or even that any amendment of the version was in contemplation. If the translation had been a new one, the rapidity of its execution would have been miraculous. The application was given in to the Assembly at the eleventh Session. The day of the month is not mentioned; but the Assembly began on the 7th of March, 1574-5. The kirk promised to deliver the authentic copy, which they (the printers) shall follow, betwixt and the last day of April. This is an interval of only six weeks; and it is to be remarked that the Assembly named only six persons, or any three of them, to oversee every book before it be printed, and likewise to oversee the labours of others that have travelled therein, to be given in to the printing betwixt and the last of April. The printers then undertook to finish the work between and the last day of March 1576, that is, in eleven months after the delivery of the authen-

tic copy. Of the six persons nominated to revise the copy, it is not certain how many acted ; but as the church seems to have thought any three of them sufficient for the task, the labour expected from them could not be very great. The church also approved of two persons, or any of them, to perform the office of corrector ; but it is certain that only one of them, namely, Mr. George Young, took any share of the duty, while he was engaged in printing the New Grammar,—and he did not begin to act till after the month of August, if indeed his services were required so soon.

The respondents (at p. 12,) have stated that the *first* proposal of Arbuthnot and Bassandyne was, that the Assembly should give them authority to print the New Bible, and fix a reasonable price at which it should be sold. They then say (p. 13,) that “ the Assembly gave a favourable answer to all the requests of the printers, except the *first*, regarding the authority to print the New Bible, and fix the price. Their answer to this is, ‘ to the *first* article, answered, refers the process to the Council.’ This (add they) plainly meant that the Assembly could not give power to print the very translation authorised by themselves, or fix its price, but that it was necessary to apply to the king and council for such permission ; thus plainly acknowledging the crown’s prerogative to print all translations whatever of the Sacred Scriptures.”

This is a very mistaken view of the *first* of the proposals of the printers, and the deliverance of the Assembly on that article. The printers took for granted that the church would patronize the work, and the proposal was, that they should approve of

the price to be charged for a Bible, printed *conform to the proof* given in, and subscribed with their hands, and that the said proofs should be delivered to the clerk of the Assembly.

The Assembly evidently did not consider this mode of proceeding as sufficiently secure, as it was not in the power of an ecclesiastical court to enforce any obligation which could be implied in the mere delivery of the specimens of the work into the hands of their clerk. They, therefore, referred this merely secular matter to the council, a court of record, in whose books it was common to register such obligations, that the authority of the Lords of Council might be interposed thereto. We do not pretend to understand the meaning of the word *process* as here introduced; but we see no reason for doubting that the only matter referred to the council related to the price to be paid for a work to be finished agreeably to the contract.

It appears, from the obligation subscribed by Arbuthnot and Bassandyne twelve months afterwards, (March 18, 1575-6,) and registered in the books of Privy Council, July 18, 1576, that “the work had not taken effect in respect of the impediments occurring;” but they engaged to finish it in nine months from the last day of March 1576, or by the end of December.

That this engagement was not fulfilled is very well known, and the reason will appear from a paper printed in the Appendix.

The respondents say (page 13,) that when the gift to Arbuthnot and Bassandyne was issued, Lekprevik may have surrendered or forfeited his licence. But his powers (they say) are confined to

the printing of the Geneva version ; and, therefore, it might be thought that the king was entitled, at the request of the General Assembly, to bestow the privilege of printing *their new translation* on a different person.

A *new translation* it was not, as we have already shown sufficiently ; but if it had been *a new one* executed by the Assembly, surely the Assembly of 1579 should have known this fact. In their dedication, however, it is expressly ascribed to “ the godly men (of the nation of England for the maist part) banished from their country for the Gospel’s cause, and convenit at Geneva, quha did faithfullie and learnedlie translate this book out of the pure fountaine of the Hebrew, Chaldaic, and Greek tongues.”

In page 14 they concede that, in the days of James VI. the office of king’s printer does not seem to have necessarily implied the right of printing the Bible without a special grant to that effect ; and, consequently, in our apprehension, the king’s power must have been considered the same with regard to the Bible and all other books. Arbuthnot was appointed king’s printer for life ; but his licence to print the Bible extended only to ten years ; so that his privilege expired only a year later than Lekprevik’s. *Importation was not prohibited.* The respondents think it likely that the omission was *per incuriam*. This gratuitous assumption is highly improbable, when it is considered how many licences had been granted repeatedly for printing other books,—in which licences importation was prohibited ; but it had never been prohibited in the case of the Bible, except in the

licence to Arbuthnot and Bassandyne, which did not take effect, as their joint obligation to print the Bible was not fulfilled within the stipulated time.

They say that whatever the crown did grant by the preceding deeds, its *power to grant* is clearly implied in one and all of them. We will not dispute what may have *then* been in the power of the crown ; but we are quite sure that the crown exercised no greater powers in restraining the importation of the Bible than any other book, or rather, that it restrained the importation of other books, while it left the importation of the Bible free and uninterrupted.

In page 15, the respondents speak of the edition of the Bible, printed under the sanction of the General Assembly, as different from that which was published in 1579,—at least, they say that we overlook that edition, though they evidently understand us to have mentioned the edition 1579. Of the edition published under the sanction of the Assembly, (which is certainly the *only one published in Scotland* previous to the year 1610,) the title of the New Testament is dated 1576, and the title of the whole book 1579. We are confident that fifty English editions may be found in Scotland, of an earlier date than 1611, (not 1610) when king James's translation was printed in England ; but no Scottish edition has ever been seen any where prior to 1611, except the edition 1579, and Andro Hart's of 1610, both in folio, and both of the Geneva translation. The respondents say that other editions may have been published, though no copy is now extant. How does it happen that English editions should be so numerous, and that nobody

has ever seen any Scottish edition, except these two, both of a size, which could not *be borne about in many men's hands* ?

The respondents next say, (p. 15,) that if Bibles, for the use of Scotland, were imported, it must have been under the sanction of the person who enjoyed the king's licence to print Bibles for the time. This is a most unreasonable supposition. No officer was empowered to import, or to license importation, and the king's printer had no power to prevent importation. They talk of the obligation of such a person to procure a proper supply for the country, either printed or imported by himself, and they say that this still remained an undoubted exercise of the crown's prerogative by *its proper officer*. “The person who had the exclusive right of printing the Bible possessed, (they say) either expressly or by implication, the power of preventing importation, except under his own proper authority ; and both the one power and the other were uniformly exercised by the crown.”

We deny that the person who had the right of printing the Bible possessed the power of preventing importation, unless that power was expressly granted to him, and unless it could be shown that when other persons obtained licences to import books, the Bible was always reserved. Now, it so happens that we have clear evidence, that in 1591 John Norton, an Englishman, received a licence to exercise, during his lifetime, the trade of inbringing and selling *all sortis of bukes*, in all languages and proven sciences,—a trade which he had previously exercised four years. The Bible is not excepted ; and, in the preamble, the king professes his

desire that his subjects be furnished of all sorts of guid bukis, and that upon guid and easye prices. According to every principle of fair construction, the Bible must be included in this licence, to bring in and *sell all sortis of books*. On no other principle than this, has the right of the English Universities to print Bibles been established ; their letters of privilege bear, that they may lawfully and freely print *all manner of books or volumes not publicly prohibited, or all manner of books approved, or to be approved by the Chancellor, &c.* On these expressions, it has been decided that the Universities have a concurrent right with the king's printer in England to print Bibles,—and, on the same expressions, Norton's right to import Bibles might have been, and no doubt was insisted on.* In the same manner, it appears to us undeniably that Andro Hart, (who complained to the Privy Council in February 1589, that John Gourlay, customer of Edinburgh, had exacted custom for books imported from Germany, and then obtained decret against him,) was in the practice of bringing into the country all sorts of books. The Lords, auditors of Exchequer, in June 1597, ordained Gourlay to desist from “asking of ony custome fra the said Andro Hart, complenar, *for ony bukes or volumis brocht in, or to be brocht in, or sauld be him within this realme, in ony time coming.*” Soon after this, (in

* In 1592, Norton was complained of to the Town Council of Edinburgh by seven booksellers, because he and his servants, being unfreemen, sold a great many books bound or unbound in smalls. The bailies ordained him to desist from any sort of books *in smalls* within the burgh. But his wholesale trade does not seem to have been objected to. Counc. Record, vol. ix. fol. 183.

1601,) the Psalms, as sung in the Kirk of Scotland, were printed at Dort, at the expense of the heirs of Henry Charteris and Andrew Hart in Edinburgh.*

The respondents, however, have said that the licence to Norton to import books, and the gift to Walgrave, October 9, 1590, constituting him king's printer for all the days of his life, as well as the licence to Zacharie Pont, giving him the office of chief imprentar within the realm during his lifetime, dated October 28, 1590, related not to printing the Bible, which belonged to Young exclusively, but to the printing and importation of other books.

It is immaterial to notice the mistake as to George Young, the Archdeacon of St. Andrews, having any right at all to the printing of the Bible in 1590 and 1591. Young had acted as corrector of the press when the Bible was printed by Arbuthnot and Bassandyne. He received a grant September 20, 1585. This he assigned, April 15, 1587, to Gilbert Masterton, who transferred his right to John Gibson, bookbinder to his Majesty, and Gibson received a new gift for 19 years, dated June 20, 1589, and a subsequent gift in 1590, both including a liberty of printing the Bible and other books, either within or without the realm, and a prohibition against all importation,—“ notwithstanding of whatever gift granted heretofore in the contrary.” But as the king's power is alleged to have been so

* Before the time of Norton, and probably before Hart, Thomas Vautrollier, bookseller, brought many books from England. On the 6th of April, 1580, he was charged by the Town Council of Edinburgh to make payment to the treasurer of the custom of all buikes brocht be him within this realm, under the pain of warding.

absolute in those days, it is to be presumed that, though the lieges were prohibited to import, his Majesty did not restrain himself, and he did not renounce the power of granting to others the liberty of importation. This privilege of his was to endure till the year 1608, and yet, in 1599, he required a licence to bring home an impression of the Psalms from Middleburg, and a prohibition against all others for seven years, or to the year 1606, though the Psalms were included in his original gift. But this was not a prohibition which prevented any one from importing Psalms, unless they were of that particular impression and form.

But it is not conceivable that there was any intention of restraining Walgrave or Pont from printing the Bible. The former was authorised to print “*all and sindrie bukis, quhilks sal be seen allowet and approvit be his Majestie, the presbytery or session of Edinburgh.*” The latter was entitled, as chief imprentare, to print “*all kynd of bukis set furth, in ony kind of tongue or language, not forbidden be the statutis and lawis of his Majesties realme.*” In 1599 also, Robert Smith received licence to print the Psalms, the double and single Catechism, and other books which we find included in Gibson’s gift,—and this was at least nine years before Gibson’s gift expired, as appears from the grant to Thomas Finlason in 1606.

The gift to Robert Charteris constituting him printer to the king for all the days of his lifetime, gave him power to print not only acts of parliament, &c. but all and sindrie buikes, volumes, werkes and writtis quhilks sal be seen, allowed, and approved be his majestie, the presbyterie or session

of Edinburgh—a description which certainly does not except Bibles. Let it be farther remarked, that instead of appointing one particular officer, even for printing acts of parliament and other acts, proclamations, &c. concerning his majestie and estate, the king seems to have appointed an unlimited number. It appears from Finlason's gift in 1606, that Robert Walgrave's right was in force till March 1604; and yet we find in December 1603, the very same powers given to Robert Charteris (and nane utheris) which had previously been conferred on Walgrave. “The title of king's printer (say the respondents) was understood to be peculiarly appropriated to the person who had the power of printing acts of parliament and state papers;” but we do not know how two or three contemporary king's printers, each apparently possessing the sole privilege, contrived to adjust their conflicting titles. And if any thing be more certain than another on this subject, it is that the king's printer was not understood to have the power of printing acts of parliament and state papers.

The respondents, without stopping to consider the Bible of Andrew Hart, who was not king's printer, and whose licence to print a Bible has never been discovered, have next proceeded to give an account of the translation of the Bible in the reign of King James, after his accession to the English crown. This account is crowded with the most glaring misrepresentations.

They say that this translation was no more connected with England than with Scotland—that four clergymen were present who represented the puritans—that Mr. Patrick Galloway, minister of Perth,

was present as representing the Church of Scotland, and that he regularly transmitted to his brethren in Scotland accounts of the proceedings, (Answers, p. 16, 17.) Now as they seem to know of Mr. Patrick Galloway's account of the proceedings, it is very singular, that instead of following this account, which would have shown them that he did not represent the Church of Scotland, they have implicitly followed the narrative of Dr. Barlow, whose authority has never obtained credit among any of our presbyterian writers. Mr. Patrick Galloway had ceased to be minister of Perth fourteen years before the time now referred to, having been one of the king's domestic chaplains from 1589 to 1607; and so effectually did he ingratiate himself, that his son was created a peer of the realm by the title of Lord Dunkeld. Galloway, instead of representing the Church of Scotland, was one of the instruments employed by the king for the very purpose of subverting the original ecclesiastical constitution established at the Reformation. It was impossible that he should have had any commission to represent the Church of Scotland in the conference, as the last General Assembly which sat in November 1602, (before Queen Elizabeth's death) could not have foreseen that any conference was to take place. That assembly had, however, recommended to presbyteries to advertise his majesty's ministers (chaplains) of "such as disliked the government or were inclined to novations," and it was also "thought expedient, and concludet that his majesty's ministers, and sic utheris of the ministerie as shall have occasion to be in any charge about his majesty inform the presbyteries of the

estate of things so far as it is needful for the weill of the cause." In this way it was that Galloway wrote to the presbytery of Edinburgh. His account of the Hampton-Court conference is far more worthy of credit than Barlow's ; for Galloway's account was corrected by the king's own hand before it was sent to the presbytery. The letter may be seen in the printed Calderwood, p. 475, &c. and in the fifth volume of his MS. History, p. 593, &c. The second of the articles comprehended in the " note of such things as shall be reformed" was the following :

" That a translation be made of the whole Bible, as consonant as can be to the original Hebrew and Greek ; and this to be set out, and printed without any marginal notes, and only to be used in *all churches of England* in time of divine service."

It is said by Calderwood, that when the letter of Mr. P. Galloway was read in the Presbytery of Edinburgh, Mr. James Melvin was present. All others keeping silence, he craved two things, first, that they would be grieved with sorrow, with many godly and learned brethren in our neighbour country, who having expected reformation, are disappointed and heavily grieved ; and that if no other way could be found for help, that they would at least help them by their prayers to God for their comfort and relief. 2. That as the presbytery of Edinburgh had ever been as the Sion and watchtower of our kirk, and the ministers thereof the chief watchmen, that they would watch and take heed that no peril come from our neighbour kirk."

It is said with great emphasis in page 17. that in the Hampton-Court conference, " four clergymen were present who represented the *puritans*"—and

that “ Dr. Reynolds acted as the spokesman for the *puritans*—and again, p. 19. that there can be little doubt that several of the translators were of the sect of the *puritans*—and all this is said as if the *puritans* had been of the same body as the Church of Scotland, or as if their concurrence in any measure could have bound the people of Scotland, or at least the members of this national church. We do not consider it correct to speak of the *puritans* as a *sect* at that period, any more than it would be to stigmatise as *sectaries* those members of more than one national church to whom the name of the *evangelical* party is sometimes assigned. The *puritans* all wished to be relieved of certain points of conformity at which their consciences scrupled ; and they wished for farther reformation in the offices of divine worship. But it is enough to say that the four clergymen, who are said to have *represented the puritans*, were not commissioned by the *puritans*, but *nominated by the king*, and that they were *all* members of the church of England and of the English universities. Calderwood says of the conference, (vol. v. p. 586, 587, MS.) “ The good professors of England were put in hopes of good beginning of reformation, and so much was pretended when the conference was appointed. But nothing less meant, yea rather under colour of conference to procure further confirmation to the abuses and corruptions. What sincerity was there meant, when for the *sincere party* were nominate two that were *very corrupt appearandly*. They were *nominate only to be spies and to prevaricate.*” The same account of their characters is given by Mr. William Scott in his MS. account of the government of the

church. Galloway says, that when the king craved to know of them what they desired to be reformed, *it was very loosely and coldly answered.* Dr. Heylin in his “Quinquarticular History,” mentions *Dr. Reynolds* and *Dr. Sparks* as being of Oxford, (the former was president of Corpus Christi College, and the latter Fellow of Magdalen College, and a Professor of Divinity,) and Mr. Knewstubs and Mr. Chatterton as of Cambridge. The last mentioned was master of Emmanuel College. The same author mentions Drs. Sparks and Reynolds as having stood firm to the Church of England. (Quinquart. Hist. c. 21. sect. 7.) Anthony Wood speaks of both Reynolds and Sparks as having written in favour of conformity.* Fuller, (in his Church History Cent. 17. B. 10. p. 48.) says of Reynolds, that “his disaffection to the discipline established in England was not so great as some *bishops* did *suspect*, or as more *non-conformists* did *believe*. No doubt he desired the abolishing of some ceremonies for the ease of the conscience of others, to which in his own practice he did willingly submit, constantly wearing hood and surplice, and kneeling at the sacrament.” Neale, in his History of the Puritans, (vol. ii. p. 22.) says, that Dr. “Reynolds fell below himself, and lost some part of his esteem with the *puritans*, being overawed by the place and company, and his sovereign opponent. The puritans (he adds) refused to be concluded by this *con-*

* Reynolds wrote a “Defence of our English Liturgy against Robert Browne his schismatical book.” Sparke wrote “A Brotherly Persuasion to Unity and Uniformity, touching the present Ecclesiastical Government and the authorised rites and ceremonies of the Church of England.” Lond. 1607.

ference" (a *mock conference* he calls it elsewhere;) and "they objected to the account of it published by Dr. Barlow, as done without the knowledge, advice, or consent of the other side, and therefore deserving no credit."*

The whole account given by the respondents, (p. 18.) with respect to the purpose for which certain bishops and ministers were summoned from Scotland in 1606, is grossly incorrect. They quote Spotswood; but we do not find in Spotswood or anywhere else, that "one point of dispute was on this very subject of the authority due to the different translations of the Bible." How should this have been a point of dispute if the Church of Scotland had been bound by the Hamptoun-Court conference? "The new translation, (it is then said,) was a matter of arrangement between both parties of the church, and both kingdoms of England and Scotland; and, as has been mentioned, the proposal did originally come from the puritans, who supported the doctrines of the Scottish Presbyterians." We maintain that the purpose for which the Scottish divines were summoned had no connection with the translation of the Bible; and so far was this from having been a matter of arrangement, that nothing was arranged at all. One of the questions proposed to the Presbyterian divines related to a matter of some importance in this case, namely, the power of the king to convoke, prorogue and dissolve ecclesiastical assemblies. This they all re-

* See also *Peirce's Vindication of the Dissenters*, p. 154; where it is said that Dr. Sparke afterwards wrote for Conformity, and that he said not a word in the controversy; also that Dr. Reynolds, and the other supposed Non-conformists, were all called to the conference by the king.

fused to acknowledge, notwithstanding the eloquent and learned sermons delivered on the subject in their hearing by four dignified clergymen of the Church of England, namely, Bishop Barlow, Dr. Buckeridge, Dr. King, and Bishop Andrews; the last of whom “teaching upon the tenth of Numbers, discoursed upon the two trumpets, and proved, as he could, the convening and discharging of councils and assemblies to belong to Christian kings and emperors.” Calderwood, p. 542. (See M‘Crie’s Life of Melville, vol. ii.; Melville’s Declining Age; Scott’s Historical Narration; Report of the Conference, 1606, MS. Adyocates Library; Heylin’s Hist. of Presbyterians, p. 379.)* The only arrangement and accommodation that followed these conferences was this—the *eight* ministers (Spotswood omits one) were never more permitted to attend the church courts, and some of them were imprisoned and banished the country.

In p. 19, the respondents seem to insinuate, that possibly some of the translators of the Bible might be from Scotland; but at any rate, (they say,) several were of the sect of puritans. Now, if they would only look at the list of the translators in Fuller’s History, or in *Lewis*, (to whom they refer,) or in Mr. Todd’s Vindication of our Authorised Translation, (Lond. 1819,) they would perceive that all the translators were of Oxford, or Cambridge, or Westminster, and that both Reynolds and Chaterton

* Heylin says, “Neither the learned discourses of these four prelates, nor the arguments of the Scottish bishops, nor the authority and elocution of the king could gain on these deaf adders, who came resolved not to hear the voice of those charmers, *charmed they never so wisely.*”

(or Chaderton,) the only puritans in the list, were masters of colleges in the English universities.

That the translators were *all* members of the church of *England*, appears from his Majesty's letter to the Bishop of London, the bishop's letter to the university of Cambridge; and the Earl of Salisbury's (Cecil's) letters to that university, all mentioned by Lewis, p. 312—316.—(See Wilkin's Concil. vol. iv. p. 407, Todd's Appendix No. iv.) His Majesty required the Bishop of London, (at that time promoted to the see of Canterbury,) to write in his name to the other bishops, signifying to them that his Majesty did strictly charge them that all excuses set apart, when any prebend or parsonage, rated or valued in the king's books at L.20 a year or upward, should happen to be void, they should admit none into it till his Majesty was certified of the vacancy, (avoidance,) that he might commend for the same such of the learned men whom he had employed about making this new translation as he should think fit to be preferred. And that his Majesty had taken the same order for such prebends and benefices as should be void in his own gift. Seven of the translators were created bishops in a very few years.

The account given by the respondents, p. 19, as if it were in the words of Wodrow, they ought to have known is copied *verbatim* from Spotswood, whose statements on this matter do not agree with other parts of the narrative of Wodrow, who speaks of the assembly at Burntisland, at which the amended translation was proposed, as a corrupt assembly, and who does not give much credit to the king for his views. “The king, (he says,) being a piece of

a poet, was fond to have some psalms turned in metre by himself, brought into public worship, and was not unwilling to have our translation brought as near as might be the English translation, where, as has been observed on Knox's life, several words and phrases used in the English edition and that of Geneva, were altered in favour of the government and ceremonies of England. Whatever were the motives, the motion was made at that meeting." Wodrow then proceeds to extract the account given by Row in his MS. history, together with Bishop Spotswood's, being all (he says) that he had met with on that subject. Calderwood's account of the proposals at Burntisland do not agree with Spotswood's. But Spotswood's testimony, if it is to be implicitly received, proves at least that nothing was done in Scotland either in the translating of the Bible or the Psalms : and that the persons employed by King James were the most learned of the *divines of the church of England*.

That King James's Bible was intended for *England* alone, and translated solely by English divines, appears sufficiently from the dedication to King James. In the first sentence the translators speak of the "great and manifold blessings bestowed *on us the people of England*, when your Majesty was sent to rule and reign over us." In the last paragraph but one, they say, "and now at last, this work being brought to such a conclusion, as that we have great hope that *the church of England shall reap good fruit thereby*, we hold it our duty to offer it to your Majesty, not only as to our king and sovereign, but as to the principal mover and author of the work."

In the epistle of the translators to the reader, the

puritans are repeatedly mentioned, but not as if any of them had really been engaged in the work. It is said, that they had used a very poor and empty shift, in refusing to subscribe the communion book on account of the corrupted translation ; and afterwards, that the translators avoided on the one hand the scrupulosity of the puritans, and on the other side, the obscurity of the papists.

The respondents say, p. 19, that not one word of objection or difference ever occurred either in England or Scotland on the subject of the new translation of the Bible. This representation does not agree with what is stated in the epistle of the translators to the reader, where they speak of many mouths having been open and not yet stopped, and where they endeavour to answer “the speeches and reasons, both of their brethren and of their adversaries, against this work.” Fuller also says, that “some of the brethren were not well pleased with this translation, suspecting it would abate the repute of that of Geneva.” But with these scruples we have little occasion to concern ourselves. We deny, however, that the translation “appears to have received the most immediate and cordial reception into this country, at a time when almost every other point or doctrine of religion was disputed.”

If it received immediate admission into Scotland, (as we have no doubt many copies of it reached this country at that time,) it must have been by importation of copies. We defy the king’s printers to produce a copy of it printed by any of their predecessors in Scotland prior to the year 1633, a period of twenty-two years after the first English edition. There was indeed an Edinburgh edition of the New

Testament in 1628, but this was printed by Andrew Hart's heirs, who were not king's printers.

They then say, that a more distinct and clear authority occurs "in regard to Scotland, than in regard to England, as this particular translation is recognised and ordered to be used in King Charles I.'s ecclesiastical canons for Scotland in the year 1636, whereas it seems to have crept into general use in England merely by common acquiescence, and without any express authority civil or ecclesiastical." They then say that "the English book of canons was promulgated by authority of the king and the church in 1603, at which time the authorised translation was that called the Bishop's Bible. This accordingly is the translation authorised by the English canons, and from this translation the Psalter, embodied with the English liturgy, is taken," (a mistake; the Psalter is from an older translation, quite different from the Bishop's, and from that older translation the gospels and epistles were also taken, till the restoration of Charles II.) They then quote Dr. Brett as saying, that "the clergy give their consent to the old translation, and not to the latter, which is in our Bibles."

Dr. Brett might be a very well-informed man on some points; but innumerable divines of greater name have conceived that the king's authority, whether it bound the laity or not, certainly bound the clergy to use the translation of King James.

We can produce copies of the *Articles of Enquiry* required to be answered at the *Episcopal visitation* in almost every diocese in England during the reigns of Charles I. Charles II. James II. and William and Mary; and in all of them one of the questions is, "Have you a large Bible of the last

translation?" or, "Have you the Bible in folio fairly bound of King James his translation?"

Did the bishops in those reigns presume to insist on the use of a translation of the Bible, which the clergy were not obliged to use by the canons ratified by the king? Was Heylin (the chaplain of an archbishop) mistaken in saying that the canons authorise this very Bible? Dr. Heylin was in the confidence of many who had taken a part in the proceedings which led to the establishment of the canons in 1603, and surely should have known which translation was understood to be authorised. He says, "For the new translation of King James his time, to shew that the translation of Scripture is no work of parliament, as it was principally occasioned by some passages in the conference at Hampton Court, without recourse unto the parliament, so was it *done only by such men as the king appointed, and by his authority alone imprinted, published, and imposed*: care being taken by the canon of the year 1603, that one of them should be provided for each several church at the charge of the parish." (*Heylin's Tracts, the Reformation of the Church of England Justified*, p. 9, 10.)

If Dr. Brett admitted that the canons of 1603 bind the spirituality, (a point on which we have not understood that there is any legal doubt,) he could not deny that the king's authority, as defined by these canons, was quite sufficient to bind every clergyman of the church of England to receive and use any translation of the Bible which the king may be pleased to authorise: (See Burn's Ecclesiastical Law—*Convocation*—and also the general preface to the work.)

What have been called the Canons of the Church of Scotland are on a very different footing. The respondents, in p. 20, mention, that in 1606 and 1612, "episcopacy was fully established in Scotland." But these acts, however, were repealed in 1690. They then say that "the king and bishops had ample powers to regulate the religious doctrine of the country; but no canons or liturgy were promulgated till the years 1635 and 1636." Before this period an act had been passed in 1633 ratifying and asserting the royal *prerogative*, a word which, according to Mackenzie, had never been used in any act of parliament till the year 1606, when it was introduced by King James, in the act preceding that by which episcopacy was then established. The church had no hand in the preparation of the Book of Canons, and so far were the members from having given their consent to the liturgy, that they were commanded by a royal proclamation to receive it not only before they had ever seen it, but even before it was prepared. In the same manner the canons were ratified by the king's "royal prerogative and supreme authority in causes ecclesiastical," on the 23d of May 1635, and by the same authority ordered to be strictly observed in all points, under severe penalties, many months before they were printed, and while some of them were not finally settled, as appears from one of Laud's letters, dated September 1635, printed by Lord Hailes, in the memorials and letters relating to the reign of Charles I. p. 13. A full account of these proceedings of the king and the archbishop of Canterbury, may be found in most of the histories of that period.

The whole body of the presbyterian ministers disclaimed the canons, because they were imposed without their consent, and without any authority of a synod, but merely by the power of the king and the advice of the prelates. (See Heylin's Life of Laud; Collier's Eccl. Hist.; The Charge of the Scottish Commissioners against Canterbury; Troubles and Trials of Laud; Baillie's Letters; The King's Large Declaration; Stevenson's History of the Church; Craufurd's MS. History, &c.) This Book of Canons required that "in every church there shall be a *Bible of the largest volume*, with the Book of Common Prayer and Psalms newly authorised. *The Bible shall be of the translation of King James.*" We cannot help saying that if this had ever been received as law, it was a law requiring the use of imported Bibles in the churches; for prior to that time there had been no Scottish edition of the Bible of King James's translation of the *largest volume*. There had been an edition in 1633, in duodecimo. There was no quarto Bible printed in Scotland for many years afterwards, and no folio edition of King James's translation was printed in Scotland during the whole of that century.

"It appears, therefore, (say the respondents, p. 21.) that King James's translation was originally authenticated and introduced into public worship in a fully more authoritative and formal manner in Scotland than in England." We ask then, "What was the translation used before this original introduction of King James's in 1636, and how were the copies procured?"

After telling us that the king at that time was head of the church in Scotland as much as in Eng-

land, and that every minister was required to acknowledge upon oath, that the king was "the only lawful supreme governor of this realm, as well in matters spiritual and ecclesiastical, as in matters temporal," an oath imposed by an act which has been long repealed, they say that "there seems to have been no express or authoritative introduction of the new translation when it first came out in 1610, (1611 they mean,) by order of the crown, either in England or Scotland. It was at once received by general consent in both countries." What then is the meaning of the words so conspicuously printed on the title-page of the first, and every subsequent edition, *Appointed to be read in Churches?* Did *Robert Barker* his Majesty's printer, insert these words without authority? Or was there any doubt that in England, before the supremacy was limited and defined by the act of settlement at the Revolution, and by the act of union of the two kingdoms, the king had complete power to regulate and prescribe the forms to be used in divine worship? (See *Burn's Eccl. Law*, art. *Supremacy.*)

The respondents say, (page 21.) that some parts of the Ecclesiastical Canons and Liturgy prepared by Charles I. for Scotland, were much disapproved of by the Presbyterians, and that the king found it necessary to issue proclamations *suspending* these canons *in some particulars*. Now the truth is, they were totally annulled, and all acts of council and proclamations which had been published for establishing them were rescinded. (See Proclamation, June 28, 1638, Sept. 9, 1638, Dec. 8, 1638; *Large Declaration*, p. 137, &c.) The General Assembly also, by the act Dec. 6, 1638; reject-

ed and condemned the *Book of Canons* as contrary to the Confession of Faith, and repugnant to the established government, the Book of Discipline, and acts and constitutions of our kirk. The following General Assembly, August 17, 1639, again condemned the Book of Canons, as without warrant or direction from the General Assembly, establishing a tyrannical power over the kirk in the person of bishops, and overthrowing the whole discipline and government of the kirk by assemblies. It appears from Baillie's account of the Assembly 1638, that no attempt was made to vindicate or approve any part of the service book or canons. "These pieces (says he) are so vile, that none of our parties to this day have ever ventured to defend them, except by these parentheses, which they make the king in his proclamations cast in for their commendation." In the MS. History of the Assembly 1638, it is said that "all the Assembly, without a contrare voice, rejected and condemned them all."

The respondents then say, that "even during the whole civil wars and Cromwell's government, when the Presbyterian religion was predominant in Scotland, this translation continued to be *solely* and universally used." They cannot prove this assertion; and we think we could show that, in private families at least, the Geneva translation was not less used than the other. We say however, that, during all that time, there was no authority for using this translation, in the same manner as there was authority for using a particular version of the Psalms. The General Assemblies, from the year 1638 to 1649, never expressly refer to this translation, and in

their quotations of Scripture they do not uniformly follow either the Geneva or King James's version. But they frequently follow the Geneva reading. Thus, Jer. xlviii. 10, they use the Geneva word *negligently*, for *deceitfully*, in King James's version; 2 Sam. x. 12, *behave valiantly*, instead of *play the men*; Psal. cxix. 137, *just* are thy judgments, instead of *upright*. The Westminster Confession of Faith, approved by the Assembly in 1647, and the Directory for public worship, approved by the Assembly in 1645, do not mention any particular translation. It is said in the Directory that "all the canonical books of the Old and New Testament (but none of those which are commonly called Apocrypha) shall be publicly read in the vulgar tongue, out of the best allowed translation." It is to be observed, particularly, that the Scripture proofs referred to were *not quoted at length* in the original edition of the Confession and other standards; but the Scriptural expressions used in the text are sometimes taken from the Geneva translation; thus, chap. i. § 8, "the word of God dwelling *plentifully* in all," (Col. iii. 16,) instead of *richly*, as in the translation now in use; and when the words used correspond to the later translation, it will generally be found that they do not vary from that of Geneva.

It is not less curious that, to this day, the preface to the Westminster Confession of Faith, first published in 1647, contains quotations from Scripture in the words of the *Geneva translation*, as Prov. xix. 2, *Without knowledge the mind cannot be good*, a passage which, in King James's version, is thus

rendered, *that the soul be without knowledge it is not good.*

We would not find it very difficult to show that considerable dissatisfaction with King James's translation prevailed among the most learned men in Scotland, even after the restoration of Charles II. We have seen a set of proposals for the bettering of the English translation of the Bible offered in the year 1665 by Mr. John Row, (the well-known author of a Hebrew grammar, printed at Glasgow in 1644,) who was principal of King's College, Aberdeen, till the year 1661, when he was removed, as were all the other members of the universities, who retained their attachment to the principles which they had avowed during the *interregnum*.

From page 21 to page 29, the respondents proceed with the consideration of the various patents, from the accession of James till the Revolution, “all of which (they say) proceed on the acknowledgment of the same power in the Crown, to give that exclusive right to its patentee; and *all of which relate to the translation of James I.* as being the ordinary translation then used and recognised in Scotland.”

Yet in mentioning the first of these, (the gift to Thomas Finlason in 1606,) they say that “the privilege extended to any translation in the vulgar tongue, though that which would probably be printed at the commencement of the patent, would be either the *Geneva translation*, or *that authorised by the General Assembly.*” Thomas Finlason was not king's printer in 1606. *Robert Charteris* held the office till 1612, with a power granted to him and his servants, (*and nane uthers,*) to print all and sundry books allowed and approved by his Majesty, the presbytery, or session of Edinburgh. But neither

Charteris nor *Finlason* printed a Bible of any translation. The licence granted to *Finlason* certainly applied to any translation. Any foreign book might be printed by any printer, provided he could obtain a licence ; and no book at that time could be printed without a licence, though it might be the composition of the printer himself. But is there any thing proved by *Finlason*'s grant except this, that the king was in the practice of conferring such grants on other persons besides his own printer ? But how the subjects could be benefited by gifts like these is not very manifest, unless it was considered to be essential to their morals to render it as difficult to procure *Bibles*, as all “sortis of *playing cards*,” which *Finlason* received the sole privilege of manufacturing and importing free of all custom for twenty-five years.

While *Charteris* was still king's printer, and *Finlason* had a licence to print the *Bible* and innumerable other books, which he never printed, and while other persons (for instance *Andrew Hart*,) had a right to import all manner of books, a *Bible* was printed, or at least published in Edinburgh by *Andrew Hart*, in 1610, *cum privilegio regie Majestatis*. It will be said by the respondents, that this was done by the licence of the proper officer. But who was the proper officer ? Was it *Robert Charteris*, who, according to their doctrine, must have been invested with the whole power of the king to print whatever books he allowed and approved ? Or was it *Thomas Finlason*, whose right they consider as absolutely exclusive with regard to *Bibles*, ballads, sonnets, *playing cards*, pictures, and the haill workis of *Sir David Lyndesay*, the very books of ballads, blasphemations, and other mischievous minstrelsy,

against which the act of parliament 1551 is known to have been aimed? Neither the one nor the other had the honour of licensing Andro Hart's Bible; for the Privy Council and the Exchequer had long before recognised Hart's right of importation of books, *free of custom*; and we know that before this time, while other persons had licences to print Bibles and Psalm Books, of which licences they made little use, Andrew Hart had at least one Bible and one Psalm Book printed for him at *Dort*.*

One circumstance concerning Hart's Bible we can state from the most authentic source of information. In 1611, it was concluded, by the *diocesan synod of St. Andrews*, "that every brother sal urge his parochiners to buy ane of the Bibles laitlie printed by Andro Hart, and the brother failzing either to caus buy ane, as said is, or ellis to gif in his exact diligens, sal pay at the next synod *sex lib.* money." This was an order of a most obsequious synod, which was at that time more observant of the king's pleasure than any other in the kingdom. The next of their ordinances was this, that every brother of the ministry within the bounds of this synod "sal hereafter resort to all yair meetings, als weill in exerceis as synod in such habites as are pertaining and prescribed be ye act of parliament, and that under the penalty thairin contained," (the pain of horning, by act 8. Parl. 20. James VI. June 24, 1609.)†

* "At Dort. Imprinted by ISAAC CANIN at the expenses of the aires of HENRY CHARTERIS and ANDREW HART in Edinburgh. Anno 1601."

† The act of the *apparel of judges, magistrates, and kirkmen*, seems to have taken for granted that the regulation of dress is one of the privileges of the Crown. It is insinuated, that the judges had been rather

The Bible required by the synod was to be *a common Bible for every kirk*; but though the records of the synod, which descend to April 1636, occasionally require parishes to provide a common Bible, they never once allude to any change of the translation.

The next grant in favour of Thomas Finlason, dated June 17, 1612, confers the title of His Hienes Printer on Finlason, because Mr. Robert Charteris had been *denounced rebel*, that is, he had unfortunately remained a year and day at His Hienes horn for a debt, said to be due to George and Margaret

slowly, so as to obtain little reverence from the common people, and the circumstance was “greatly censured by strangers resorting in these parts.” Some of the ecclesiastical profession, chiefly those having vote in parliament, fell into great contempt “by occasion of their light and indecent apparel.” It is then said that the king, “wha is maist godlie, wise, and religious, hating all erroneous and vain superstition, just in government, and of lang experience therein, knowis better than ony living what appertains and is convenient for every estate in their behaviour and duty,” and therefore the apparel of kirkmen, as well as of judges, is referred to the king. We do not know if the king gave an exclusive privilege to his tailor to furnish all the suits, prohibiting importation from London and other outlandish places; but the act is fully more strongly declaratory of the power of the king in this matter, than the act of 1551 is in regard to the printing and publishing of books. Sir George Mackenzie thinks, that this act for the apparel of judges, &c. is not in desuetude; and he says that “having been made in favour of the king and monarchy, it cannot run in desuetude without their consent, and it is thought, that, by virtue of it, none who are lords of the session can be provosts, these being incompatible employments,” &c. He does not say, that the ordering of apparel for judges, magistrates, and kirkmen, is *inter regalia*; but he refers to *Lampridius in vita Severi*, as to the distinction of habits amongst magistrates; and this was probably an indirect way of saying the same thing; as from the time of Augustus the Roman emperors exercised unlimited power in this matter. It is curious that the act 1551 immediately preceding that which relates to printing, shows (as Sir George Mackenzie observes) that the “secret council used by their own authority to make sumptuary laws both as to meat and clothing.”

Smith, which he was unable to pay.* Finlason's gift puzzles the respondents, because one clause "appears to *except the right of printing the Bible*, after having formerly conferred it in the same grant." Now it is only necessary to look at the collocation of the clause, to be convinced that it does not at least prevent Finlason from printing the Bible; but, standing where it does, in the middle of the prohibitory clause, it evidently allows the Bible, New Testament, and Psalm Book, to be printed and imported by others as well as by Finlason. The Bible, New Testament, and Psalm Book, were printed by others, (at least by Hart,) and they were in fact all imported at that period too. Nothing is more common than to find Hart's Psalms of a quarto size, particularly his edition of 1615, annexed to English editions of the Bible; and the separate Psalm Books of Hart and his heirs, from 1611 to 1636 at least, are as well known as any books which were ever printed in Scotland.

Nearly a year before Finlason was nominated king's printer, he received a privilege for printing acts of parliament; and all others were prohibited under pain of confiscation. Charteris still held the office.

In 1612, (July 2,) it is stated in a proclamation anent printing of books, that "Many books are bought and sold in the kingdom, which are not printed in the same." The proclamation does not prohibit importation, but it charges all book-

* The casualties of single and liferent escheat incurred by horning and denunciation for civil debt in Scotland, were taken away and abolished for ever by the Act 20. Geo. II. c. 50. Charteris was a victim to the old statute.

sellers that when they bring home books to be sold, they do no way presume to utter any *written by any popish or suspect writer*, without licence from his Majesty's secretary, or from the bishop of the diocese. Not a word is said of any other books. But if the doctrine of the respondents be well founded, it would have been in the power of Thomas Finlason either to print or to import the *Rhemish* or the *Douay* Bible, (though written by popish and suspect writers,) and to give licence to any person to import these, or any other editions of “the Auld and New Testaments in our vulgar tongue, or in Latin.”

The proclamation anent the printing of books beyond sea, (June 1615,) does not prevent books from being published and printed beyond sea, if they have been previously approved by the two archbishops and the secretary of state.

The licence to Gilbert Dick, (mentioned p. 23,) dated Feb. 10, 1618, gives him the sole power of printing *two Catechisms, authorised by the archbishops*. This was within the period of 25 years, during which Finlason, by his first gift in 1606, was authorised to print Catechisms; and it was within the period of Finlason's second gift, by which he was constituted king's printer, and had the right of printing all works allowed and approved by his *highness, the archbishops of St. Andrews or Glasgow, and all other books agreeable with God's word*. Is it possible, then, that Finlason could be prevented from printing these catechisms? These catechisms were *appointed to be taught within the kirks of the kingdom of Scotland*. Why then did not the king's printer print them? or why was not

his licence sufficient to entitle Dick to print them, if he had not time for a task which could not surely be very laborious ? How did it come to pass too, that after this period, as well as before, Andrew Hart printed Catechisms for the use of the kirk of Edinburgh, as did also John Wreitton and others ?

The same observations apply to the case of the licence of June 30, 1619, authorising Dick to print a Book of Common Prayer and two Catechisms. Hart and Raban printed Books of Common Prayer, Confessions of Faith, Psalms, and Catechisms ; and in 1633, the king's printers, for the first time in Scotland, printed the Book of Common Prayer for the church of England, which the king ordered the dean of his chapel royal at Edinburgh to introduce that year. Row says in his MS. History, that only six lords of the privy council, seven lords of session, two advocates, one writer to the signet, with the clerk to the bills, and two young lords, conformed to the order. In Lord Hailes's Memorials, vol. ii. p. 1, 2, we find a scolding letter from Charles I. to the lords of session, (transcribed from the *Books of Sederunt*,) in which the members of the College of Justice are charged with being leaders of the other subjects in disobeying the orders of the church. The king's supremacy in ecclesiastical matters was therefore not very generally recognised by one of the highest courts of law in this kingdom, even at the time when the archbishop's son was president of that court.

In p. 23, the respondents mention the licence to Walter Finlason, (Jan. 17, 1628,) which, they admit, clearly included the right of printing the Bible ; but as his right extended only to the books included in his father's gifts, the limitation with regard to the

Bible was unquestionably one of the conditions under which he enjoyed the other privileges of his office.*

We may almost pass by the licence to Sir William Alexander, (1627). It is well known that he was translator of most of the Psalms in the collection ascribed to king James, and that the alterations made on these Psalms in the successive editions subsequent to the death of king James, metamorphosed them so completely as to have made them quite a new book. The people of Scotland were indignant at the attempt to introduce them into the worship of the church. But one thing we must not omit to state. The only edition of these Psalms which was ever destined for the use of churches in Scotland, was printed, not by his Majesty's printers for Scotland, nor by any such functionary, but by Thomas Harper in London, in 1636. This is the edition which is bound up in the same volume with the Book of Common Prayer, referred to in the canons of 1636,—the two books being jointly designed the Book of Common Prayer and Psalms newly authorised. If by this canon, during the momentary term while it was in force, the Psalms used in the churches were indubitably an English edition, who can deny that the Bible might as well be English?

In p. 24, Young and Tyler's patent, under the great seal, is mentioned, as having been granted when Walter Finlason's expired in 1641. There was an intervening patent to Robert Young, a printer in London, who published a New Testament and a

* The right certainly was not exclusive, and accordingly during the whole term of its continuance we find books printed by Hart's heirs, or Writton, or Rabau, or Bryson, for the use of churches.

Bible in 1633, with Edinburgh on the title page, and who published, at London, the King's Large Declaration in 1639. We know nothing of the manner in which Walter Finlason's claims were disposed of.

The patent to Young and Tyler deserves the most particular consideration. It provides that the patentees shall have the *common benefit* of printing the *Psalms in use for the Church of Scotland*, with *Testaments* and other books for the *use of our said kingdom, as other printers there have*: (“habebunt commune beneficium excudendi *Psalmos* nunc in usu pro ecclesia nostra *Scotiæ* cum *Testamentis* aliisque libris pro usu regni nostri *ut alii typographi ibidem habent*,”) and it ends with these words, “*Proviso tamen quod* præsentes sint absque præjudicio aut impedimento alicui alii typographo infra dictum regnum nostrum *Scotiæ* excudere *Biblia in folio*, vel alios libros impressos in dicto regno nostro quo-cunque tempore ante datam primæ nostræ donationis præscriptæ in favorem dicti Roberti Young concessæ.” This clause clearly establishes what we have all along affirmed with regard to Andrew Hart and other printers, who printed Bibles, Psalms, Catechisms, and other books, even before the date of Young's first patent in 1632, the substance of which is recited in the patent of 1641. If the leave of his Majesty's printers had been required for printing these other books—and if, at the same time, Young and Tyler received all the privileges ever enjoyed by their predecessors, it is very strange that this privilege, if enjoyed by their predecessors, should have been withheld from them. Nothing can be plainer than that here every facility is granted to any print-

er in Scotland to print folio Bibles, as Andrew Hart had done, or to print other books, printed in Scotland before the date of the first gift in favour of Young in 1632.

It is equally manifest that the only importation prohibited in this grant is importation from *France, Holland, or other places beyond seas.*

The respondents speak of a power of exporting Bibles from Scotland into England, and say, that “the patentees appear to have *consented* to the equivalent power of importation from England into Scotland.” Their consent, however, could not be the condition on which other printers had a right of printing Bibles before the date of their first patent. We ask too, if a patent under the great seal of Scotland could, of itself, give a right to export into England.

They then tell us that the rights of Young and Tyler were never afterwards disputed, even during the commonwealth. No wonder. Tyler was very subservient to a government which was as absolute as the monarchy had been. He did not scruple to print papers reflecting on the king,—such as “The King of Scotland’s Negotiations at Rome for assistance against the Commonwealth of England, published to satisfie such as are not willing to bee deceived—Edinburgh, printed by Evan Tyler, in the year 1650.” But we deny that he printed any Bibles after this time in Scotland. He resided in England, where he printed many books, such as “*Robertson’s Gate of the Holy Tongue, &c. 1654.*” And in London too, we find him printing a Bible (with plates) for a *Society of Stationers* in 1653. We question if there be more than one copy of this

Bible now to be had in all Scotland ; but hundreds of people possess copies of the Bible printed at that period at Cambridge,—and there are at least three other English editions of pocket Bibles of the year 1653, two by Field, and one by Giles Calvert, which there is no great difficulty in procuring in this country, and which were certainly not imported by Tyler's leave.

Concerning *Evan Tyler*,* we may remark, that for several years he acted as printer for the church. The acts 1638 were printed by Andrew Hart's heirs in 1639, but the acts of the subsequent years from 1639 to 1649 were printed by Evan Tyler. This must have been under the appointment of the Assembly, as, by the act, sess. 26, Dec. 20, 1638, “the Assembly *unanimously*, by virtue of their ecclesiastical authority, dischargeth and inhibiteth all printers within this kingdom, to print any *act of the former Assemblies*, any of the *acts or proceedings of this Assembly*, any *Confession of Faith*, &c. or *any other treatise whatsoever which may concern the kirk of Scotland, or God's cause in hand*, without warrant subscribed by Mr. Archibald Johnston as clerk to the Assembly, and advocate for the kirk.”† When the Psalms now used in the Church

* Robert Young's name seldom appears after 1641. Evan Tyler was considered as having forfeited his gift in 1650, and Charles II. appointed another who is not known ever to have printed any thing. During the commonwealth Christopher Higgins printed the acts of parliament and other public papers. But Tyler returned to his office in 1660.

† In the acts of the General Assembly 1648, it is said (sess. 21.) “the General Assembly and their Commissioners are now deprived of their liberty of printing, confirmed and ratified by act of parliament ; there being an inhibition to the contrary upon the PRINTER,

of Scotland were approved by the Assembly in 1649, Evan Tyler was one of the printers who published them in 1650, both in a separate volume, and in two or three sizes still found in the same volume with English Bibles; but *Gideon Lithgow*, printer to the city and university, also printed them in various forms, both in that and subsequent years. No copy of the Bible printed in Scotland between 1649 and 1672 is known to exist. And such copies of the Psalms, the New Testament, or the Confession of Faith which are to be found of that age, were printed by persons who pretended to no patent. Evan Tyler, however, printed the acts of parliament from the Restoration to the time of Anderson's appointment in 1671.

Of Anderson's patent it is needless to say much. The respondents acknowledge that it contained very improper powers. The report by Lord Fountainhall, January 5, 1683, *Anderson* against *Lindsay*, deserves particular notice. "The *Lords* (says he) found Anderson's gift contained exorbitant clauses, &c. and therefore they restricted his gift to the style, tenor and books named in Evan Tyler's gift, who was his majesty's father's printer in Scotland." Evan Tyler's gift was that of 1641, which did not prevent importation except from France, Holland, and other places *beyond seas*, and it gave only a common right of printing Psalms for the Church of Scotland, with Testaments and other books. It allowed no body else to print Bibles or English

under the pain of death, by the Committee of Estates." In spite of this threat, the acts of the Assembly of that and the following year, with many other papers of the church, were printed by Evan Tyler.

Prayer Books for exportation ; but it allowed any printer in Scotland to print the Bible in folio, as has been already explained.

The respondents dwell much on Anderson's consent to that clause of the decree of the privy council, December 21, 1671, giving as full liberty to Robert Sanders or *any other printer* in the kingdom to print the New Testament and Psalm Book as the king's printer himself possessed. Why did he give his consent ? For no other reason than this, that his opposition would have been unavailing. It is said in the decree of the Court, March 6, 1680, that the concession with regard to this and other books was granted by the king's printer for peace sake. That he should have granted it for peace sake to a rival, is rather surprising ; but that he should have granted it in favour of any printer in the kingdom indiscriminately, was not only a great sacrifice of interest, if he had the monopoly of books so much in demand, but according to the views sometimes taken by the respondents, a very gross dereliction of his duty. For how could he be responsible for the errors in all these copies, unless he thought that the penalties threatened in the act of the privy council, (February 9, 1671,) occasioned by an incorrect New Testament which he had printed himself, were sufficient to deter all others from committing errors equally gross ? In that act prohibiting any of the printers of this kingdom to publish the Old or New Testament till they be carefully revised and corrected, it is implied that the printing of the scriptures was not confined to the king's printer.

In page 29. the respondents explain away our

construction of the restriction of Anderson's gift to the *style, tenor* and *books* named in Tyler's gift. They say that "Lindsay's licence had nothing to do with the Bible; and the dispute between him and Mrs. Anderson related solely to the printing of ordinary books." Ordinary books! It contains a right of printing all kinds of books (except acts of parliament, proclamations and such public papers,) provided they contained nothing contrary to the established religion. "Omnia librorum genera cu-juscunque linguae artis seu scientiae," &c. This is as much as the English universities can show for their privilege of printing Bibles. And it concludes with declaring that this letter shall not prejudice the gift granted to the deceased Andrew Anderson, in as far as it can be extended to the privileges contained in the gift of the same office to the deceased Evan Tyler. And it is farther declared, that this clause shall by no means render the above exception as to proclamations and acts of parliament null and void. The exception with regard to acts of parliament, bore that they were not to be printed by Lindsay or any of his heirs, substitutes, or colleagues without a special privilege. If Lindsay had assumed Anderson's heirs or assignees as partners, he might have contrived, under the protection of a gift in the terms of Evan Tyler's, to print acts of parliament and proclamations. But here we have a farther restriction even beyond the terms of Evan Tyler's gift. And it is impossible to suppose that it was intended that Anderson's heirs, who had proved their unfitness for their duty, should have greater power in printing the Bible, or preventing its importation, than Tyler had ever possessed.

The privy council, it is said, (page 29,) gave "Mrs. Anderson the exclusive right to print Poole's Annotations, and the Works of Durham and Campbell, and prohibited all persons from interfering with the same under pain of confiscation." But *it did not prohibit the importation* of these works. And it allowed some other works claimed by the king's printer, to be printed, imported and sold by any person whatsoever. In fact, Mrs. Anderson had been at great expense in preparing these works for publication, and the council granted her the sole privilege of printing them for such a number of years as the Committee might think fit, "provided the committee were satisfied as to the fineness and sufficiency of the paper and types." We do not, however, understand that the privy council in this act recognised the right of the crown at all. They gave no deliverance on the extent of the privileges of his majesty's printer. They could find nothing in the patent entitling his majesty's printer to print Poole's Annotations any more than Flavel's Works,—both being theological works by English authors not published when the patent was granted. The council indeed did nothing more in this case than they were wont to do to any bookseller who presented what to them seemed a reasonable claim. As Anderson's gift, though ratified by parliament, was subject to their discretionary regulation, they gave a licence for a limited time, and as they judged of the manner in which the duty was done, and the reasonableness of the prices, the worst effects of monopoly were prevented.

We might have mentioned two licences granted by James VII. before the Revolution; one to James Watson, and, after his death, another to Peter Bruce,

as printer to his Majesty's family and household. In virtue of these licences, they printed a number of popish books at Holyroodhouse. Anderson does not seem to have ventured to challenge their right ; but the estates of Scotland complained of this grant as being a violation of the liberties of the kingdom. King James, if his prerogative was indeed as great as his father and his grandfather wished theirs to be considered, was entitled to introduce Popery by his ecclesiastical supremacy. And one of the methods which he took was to appoint printers according to his own heart in England, as well as in Scotland. It is truly mortifying to think that Bibles were printed by *Henry Hills*, and at the same time to look into the monstrous doctrines contained in such books as the following : “ The Question of Questions, which, rightly resolved, resolves all our questions in religion ; by James Mumford, priest of the society of *Jesus*. *Permissu Superiorum*. London, printed by *Henry Hills*, printer to the King's most excellent Majesty, for his household and chapel, 1686-7.” The running title of this book to page 262, is in these words, “ *The Bible is not our judge* ;” and 260 pages more are employed to show that “ *the Roman Church is our infallible judge*.” This book, written before the restoration of Charles II. contains the most violent abuse of all the reformers, and particularly of the translators of the Bible, and concludes with denouncing damnation against all who, holding the Scriptures to be the certain rule of faith, refuse to submit to the judgment of the church of Rome as the only infallible guide. Another more insidious book, published also by H. Hills, printer to the king's most excellent Majesty, 1686, is entitled, “ *Historical Collections out*

of several grave Protestant Historians, concerning the changes of Religion, and the strange Confusions following." Bishop Parker's book, entitled, *Reasons for abrogating the Test*, reprinted at Holyroodhouse in 1688, was perhaps a still more indecent book, "full of petulant scurrility," calling the test "the sacrament of Oatesian villainy—treating the Parliament with a scorn that no Popish writer had yet ventured on—and saying much to excuse transubstantiation and to free the church of Rome from the charge of idolatry." This book was licensed by the Earl of Sunderland, and the stationers were not allowed to print any answer to it; but Dr. Burnet, then in Holland, wrote an answer, which exposed Parker to merited shame, and utterly ruined his reputation. Another paper, entitled *Reasons for abrogating the penal statutes*, was printed at Holyroodhouse in 1686. It was supposed to have been the joint production of a confederacy of Jesuits, and to have received its last touches from the pen of Sir Roger L'Estrange. (A copy of this mischievous pamphlet, with an answer to it, may be seen in Wodrow's History, vol. ii. appendix, Nos. 118 and 119.) Such were some of the effects resulting from the unbounded prerogative claimed by the king at the time when the parliament acknowledged his supremacy; and such were some of the cogent reasons which induced the parliament of Scotland, after the Revolution, to disclaim his Majesty's supremacy.

The respondents sum up the result of their deduction of patents (page 30) in terms which we do not admit to be authorised by the premises.

1. The act, 1551, c. 27, did not declare "the exclusive right of the crown to prevent printing of all kinds, except by its own license." Whoever attends

to the words of the act must perceive that only a certain description of books required a licence from the king. It applied only to books which required to be seen, viewed and examined by the superiors, that it might be ascertained if they tended to the “defamation and slander of the lieges.”* The Bible is not of the number of *sik bukis*. Wherever the respondents fall in with a licence to print or to import, which mention *books of all sorts*, or *approved books*, or *books allowed by his Majesty and the church-courts*, they say that such a licence has no reference to the Bible. But here, when the terms are not nearly so comprehensive, they insist that the Bible is included in a description of books, all of which were understood at the time to be libellous or satirical. The act 1551 imposed a restraint on the liberty of the press which does not now exist with respect to any book of the most objectionable description. The king cannot, by his prerogative, prevent the printing of any such books. But, even if he possessed this power, does the act say any thing of importing books? Was Bishop Douglas’ Virgil, which was printed at London in 1553, the year after this act passed, prevented from being brought into Scotland, because it had not been examined by some wise and discreet persons depute thereto, and a special licence obtained?

2. They say that the uninterrupted series of grants by the crown, for three centuries, “clearly and demonstrably recognise and establish the complete control of the crown over printing.” The complete control of the crown over printing! If they prove this, they prove too much. Does the crown indeed possess a complete control over the press?

* See Appendix.

“ *If* (say they) the power as to ordinary books has been lost by desuetude, and by the more liberal and enlightened views of modern times, there is not through the whole course of our history for above three centuries, a single instance of Bibles, and other prerogative books, having been exempted from the control of the crown, or of their printing being allowed to the public at large.” Have they then forgotten the patent to Young and Tyler, and the previous licence to Finlayson in 1612? We have already said that, instead of a single instance, innumerable instances might be produced of prerogative books (as they call them) having been printed by persons who had no patents. Andrew Anderson printed the New Testament before he had a patent; and though he printed it as ill as possible before he had a patent, he printed it no better afterwards. Watson printed it in 1706, six years before he had a share in any patent. Many others printed the New Testament without patents, or any licences which can be traced, and certainly while others were represented to have exclusive rights of printing. We cannot number the editions of the Confession of Faith, and of the Psalms, which were printed in the last century (many of them within the memory of man) by persons who had no patents. And among these editions, not a few are the best which can still be procured. Such editions of the Confession of Faith are used to this day in some of the church-courts; and if they are not authentic, it is impossible to say how few of the ministers and elders have subscribed the proper standards. * Many such Psalm

* The copy used in the presbytery of Dundee is a quarto, which has on the title, Printed at London for the Company of Stationers,

books are still used in the churches of the established church, not to mention those which are used in private families and dissenting places of worship.

But even if it were true that the usage of printing had been as uninterrupted as they represent it, and “bottomed on an act of Parliament,” which says nothing of importation, we say that the usage of importation has been much less interrupted, (for there have been periods when the Bible was not printed, but none when it was not imported), and that this usage of importation had its origin in an act of Parliament, which in giving the people leave to read the Bible in their own tongue, gave them leave to read an imported translation. This leave was never taken away by any subsequent act of the legislature, and the right having thus been exercised through an unbroken series of “the years of many generations,” has assuredly not been lost by desuetude.

That this constant and uninterrupted *consuetude* of importing Bibles from England has prevailed, will not be disputed by any one who will take the trouble of inquiring,

1. What a variety of English editions are used as pulpit Bibles in all parts of Scotland, and how few Edinburgh editions, except such as are of modern date;

2. What a great number of the families of all

1658, and reprinted at Glasgow by Robert Sanders, printer to the city and university, 1675. The copy used at St. Andrews, and subscribed by the ministers, elders, professors, preachers, and school-masters since the year 1695, is an edition printed in 1688, (without any printer’s name,) very superior to Anderson’s editions of that period. The copy used in the presbytery of Forfar is the *London* edition, 1717. See Appendix—List of editions of the Confession of Faith.

ranks and descriptions of persons in Scotland possess Bibles printed in England, with Scottish Psalms, bound in the same volume. We can produce such Bibles of almost every ten years from the year 1579 to 1799, many of them having inscribed on them names of well known families in Scotland, and a great proportion of them being such as must have been imported in the time of Finlason's, Young's, Tyler's, and Anderson's patents ;

3. What a number of editions, printed in England, may be seen in the seats of different public bodies in the churches.

We may produce other proofs in the sequel, particularly one which may be drawn from the catalogues of the principal booksellers in Scotland.

The respondents, in p. 30, deduce a *third* inference from the series of patents, viz. That the right of the crown was not confined to any particular edition or translation of the work. They then say that during the 16th century "the kings of Scotland recognised and included in their grants, *Cranmer's Bible*, the *Geneva Bible*, and the *General Assembly's Bible*, none of which, except the last, had been translated in this country." We say that there never was any grant in the 16th century which applied to any except the Geneva ; for the General Assembly's, as they call it, was the *Geneva Bible*. No grant ever applied either to Cranmer's or to the Bishop's Bible. And the licences for printing the Geneva Bible were no more necessary than the licence for printing any book whatever. In the 16th century only one edition of any translation was printed in Scotland ; but during 58 years of that century the people were supplied with Bibles.

The respondents then say, that it has been seen, with regard to King James's translation, that "it was as much designed for Scotland as for England,—that it was introduced into this country more solemnly and more authoritatively than into England,—that it has been universally received by all sects and parties *since that time*, and that it has been recognised in every successive royal grant since it was executed."

The first and second of these positions have been disproved,—the third is immaterial, but not altogether correct, if Papists and Unitarians be included among the sects and parties; and it cannot be said to have been received even by the numerous individuals of the established church who do not understand the English language. As to the last position, we see no reason for saying that it has been recognised, as the words *Biblia sacra in lingua Anglicana* apply equally to all translations into the English language.

The reasoning which follows in pages 31 and 32 rests on a very unstable foundation.

They tell us that King William was strongly inclined to continue Episcopacy as the established religion of Scotland as well as England, if he could have prevailed on the people to agree to it, but was persuaded to give up the attempt; and when the crown of Scotland was offered to him by the convention of states, he objected to the oath to preserve Presbyterianism as originally framed, as it carried the authority of the church too far—and he adjected an explanation of the oath; thus showing his determination to preserve the necessary prerogatives of

the crown, and to secure religious toleration to all his subjects. On these moderate views, they say, the acts 1689, c. 3, abolishing Prelacy, and 1690, c. 5, establishing Presbyterianism, and ratifying the Confession of Faith, were framed ; so as to do what was necessary for the establishment of Presbyterianism, but no more. The acts and proclamations establishing Episcopacy, are recited in the act 1690 ; but they are not repealed *in toto*. There is this important qualification, they say, in the act, “ And that in so far allenarly as the said acts and others generally and particularly above mentioned are contrary or prejudicial to, inconsistent with, or derogatory from the Protestant religion, and Presbyterian government now established.” Every power and prerogative therefore (they say) held by the crown in ecclesiastical affairs is reserved entire by this saving clause, provided they be consistent with Presbyterian government. Now (add they) it is impossible to contend that the crown’s prerogative as to printing the Bible is inconsistent with this form of worship, or that its establishment is prejudicial to the authority of King James’s translation. They then repeat a number of their mistaken statements as to the translations formerly in use, and the exclusive grants of imprinting and importing to a variety of persons, whose grants, we have seen, were not exclusive.

The account of King William’s hesitations is little to the purpose, as it cannot be denied that, whatever *his private inclinations* might be, he declared, in the act abolishing Prelacy, that with advice and consent of the estates of Parliament he will settle by law that church government in this kingdom which is

most agreeable to the inclinations of the people. The respondents refer to M'Cormick's Life of Carstairs ; but that author, so far from saying that the king was inclined to have Episcopacy continued in Scotland, if he could have prevailed on the people in this country to agree to it, says (p. 43,) that presbytery would have been more agreeable to his own principles than episcopacy,—yet if the church of England could have been brought to lower their terms of communion, so as to comprehend the bulk of non-conformists in that kingdom, he was fully determined never to abolish episcopacy in Scotland. M'Cormick says nothing of the king's objection to the oath,—and though Burnet says that he gave a verbal explanation (a very proper one we think) of the clause by which he was bound to repress heresies,—observing, that he did not bind himself to persecute any for their consciences ; it is certain that, in his own letter to the estates, he signified no scruple, but expressed himself thus, “we did take and sign the oath tendered to us by your commissioners, which (by God's assistance) we will religiously observe.” Do the respondents mean to insinuate that, by a mental reservation, he resolved to preserve any prerogative disclaimed in his oath ? Most certain it is, that his transient explanation of the oath had no reference to any branch of the prerogative.

It is quite incomprehensible how they could say that every power held by the Crown, in ecclesiastical affairs, is reserved entire by the saving clause, which they suppose to be implied in the word *alle-*
narly ; for it cannot be admitted that if any of these acts assert the King's supremacy, *that part* of the acts remained in force, in spite of the act of the same Par-

liament, in which it is declared, that the supremacy is abrogated as being “inconsistent with the establishment of the church government now desired.” On the words, “in so far allenarly,” &c. nothing like the prerogative now claimed can be supported, as “all superiority of any office in the church in this kingdom above presbyters,” is expressly abolished in the act abolishing prelacy.

The only thing worthy of notice under the third inference, p. 32, is the usage of the Crown, from the Revolution to the present time; but to this we oppose the unrestrained and uninterrupted usage of importing Bibles during the whole of that period.

4th, With regard to the ground or principle of expediency, the respondents deride the opinion of Blackstone, though we find his opinion still maintained by the latest English writers on the law of prerogative, (particularly *Chitty*.)

Their historical statements are very erroneous. King James was not the head of the church in Scotland, as much as in England, when the new translation was executed. He was never acknowledged in Scotland as Henry VIII. had been in England, by the expressed submission of the clergy.

Their next statement, about Henry VIII. having first granted his licences to the Universities for printing in general, before he assumed the character of head of the church, proceeds on a palpable and glaring anachronism. The earliest licence to the University of Cambridge was granted in 1535. According to Burnet, in his History of the Reformation, (Part iii. Book ii.) the King claimed the character of head of the church, and was acknowledged in that capacity by the clergy in 1530. The final

submission of the convocations, both of Canterbury and York, was concluded in 1531. The first act of the Parliament, 1534, confirmed what had been already acknowledged by the clergy, that “the King was the supreme head in earth of the Church of England.” This was a year before the licence to Cambridge, and by that time an order had been given for printing the Bible.

The respondents next quote Bankton, who says, that “the King or other sovereign power, as the fountain of all jurisdiction, may justly be denominated head of the national church,” in a sense which is not very consistent with the doctrines of this national church, or supported by any legislative enactment. But, after all, Bankton says no more than this, Book i. tit. 2. sect. 25. (p. 51.) “The established church is a great corporation, whose representative is the General Assembly, &c. Their spiritual power to instruct, exhort, bind, and loose the inward man, and exercise other parts of the ministerial function, is no doubt derived from the divine commission, (Mat. xxviii. 19.) ; but the privileges competent to them as an aggregate body, or a national church, certainly proceed from the sovereign power establishing the true religion and presbyterian church government amongst us, in virtue whereof the ministers of it enjoy the benefices, parish churches, and the exercise of ecclesiastical power in this country.” He then says, (Book iv. tit. 22. sect. 1.) that “as the national church is a great body politic, all the authority and jurisdiction they are entitled to exercise in this or any other country is derived from the sovereign power of the nation where they are established. In this sense, the King, (or other sovereign

power,) as the fountain of all jurisdiction, may justly be denominated the head of this national church. And the jurisdiction of the clergy in that respect, so far as concerns the exercise of the same in this country, is of the nature of a civil right. But as to their spiritual powers, the same are derived from a higher fountain, viz. the divine Founder of our holy religion. This must extend to their successors—that being the implied quality of the grant, which is to the end of the world. This I conceive is the only meaning of the intrinsic power of the church ; and in this sense it is justly declared by our legislature, that Christ alone is the Head of the church.” It is evident, that the sense in which Bankton views the term, the sovereign power, applies rather to the legislature than to the supreme magistrate.

But, if we contrast what Bankton says of the Church of England, with what he says of the Church of Scotland, we shall more clearly perceive how different is the relation in which the King stands to the one church and to the other.

Speaking of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in England, he says, “ The highest ecclesiastical court is the convocation of the clergy, called likewise a national synod. It is convened by the king’s writ. As to the making of *new canons*, they are to have the king’s licence to that purpose ; and, when made, they must have his royal assent for putting them in execution.”

On the Church of Scotland, he says, “ When the Episcopal church subsisted with us, the king, by his proclamation, did appoint the time and place of their national or Assembly’s meeting ; nor could they treat of any thing but what was authorised under his royal hand ; and their canons, acts, and ordi-

nances behoved to be confirmed by his Majesty.” (Parl. 1663, c. 5.) He then adds, “It may therefore be questioned, how at present we are safe against such abuses by our General Assemblies: as perhaps they may usurp a jurisdiction that does not belong to them, against which there does not lie an appeal,” &c.

After mentioning the act 1592, to which reference is had as the rule in the act 1690 restoring presbytery, he says, “the privilege here granted to the general assembly to *appoint its own meetings* in the above case, (the case of the absence of the king’s commissioner,) and that *its acts shall be good without the royal assent*, is higher than the church in the Roman empire, which was their national church, was indulged in ancient times.”

“ The jurisdiction of the general assembly is either constitutive or judicial. The first consists in making *acts* and *canons*, ordering the method of procedure in cases before them, and other affairs touching the discipline and government of the church, in the same manner as other corporations make bye-laws,” &c.

The quotation from Erskine (p. 34.) may be answered by a reference to Pardovan’s “ collections and observations concerning the worship, discipline, and government of the church of Scotland,” a book of high authority in matters of church law, recommended by the General Assembly 1709. “ Though the sovereign’s person be sometimes represented (in the assembly,) yet his name cannot be joined with the general assembly in making of acts: because the civil magistrate, considered as such, is neither head nor member of the church, nor of any

of her judicatories ; and it is the authority of the general assembly of this national church that can alone bind her members. And though ecclesiastical constitutions should be enacted in the sovereign's name and authority, yet these could never bind the subjects as such, because the legislative power is lodged in the sovereign and estates of parliament, and in them only. Hence all petitions to the general assembly are only addressed to the moderator and members thereof, and not to the sovereign nor his commissioner though present. For petitions can be presented to none but to such as those in whose name and authority they are granted."

The king's commission to his representative in the assembly does not profess to give him any power of interfering in the acts or proceedings ; and no ratification of the acts is necessary, as is the case with all canons and constitutions of the church of England before they can bind even the clergy. The presence of the king or his commissioner is not necessary to the constitution of a general assembly, according to the act 1592, ratified by the act 1690.

The quotation of part of the 23d chapter of the confession proves nothing to the purpose, if the whole of this chapter and other parts of that book be taken into consideration.*

It is not said that the civil magistrate has the *sole authority* to take order that unity and peace be preserved, the truth kept pure and entire, blasphemies and heresies suppressed, corruptions and abuses in worship and discipline prevented or reformed, and all the ordinances duly settled, admi-

* See Appendix.

nistered and observed. The second Book of Discipline, (c. 7.) and the act of parliament 1592 still in force, have said, "It appertains to the eldership to take heed that the word of God be duly preached within their bounds, the sacraments rightly ministered, the discipline rightly maintained," &c. The Confession of Faith (c. 31.) has said, "It belongeth to synods and councils, ministerially to determine controversies of faith and cases of conscience, to set down rules and directions for the better ordering of the public worship of God and government of his church, to receive complaints in cases of mal-administration, and *authoritatively to determine the same*," &c. The same chapter admits that magistrates may lawfully call a synod of ministers, and other fit persons, to consult and advise with about matters of religion ; but if magistrates be open enemies to the church, the ministers of Christ, of themselves, by virtue of their office, or they, with other fit persons upon delegation from these churches, may meet together in such assemblies. This chapter is particularly explained in the act of assembly approving the Confession of Faith. The 23d chapter " of the Civil Magistrate," which is quoted by the respondents, evidently does not relate altogether to the *chief magistrate*. But if it did, the concluding part of it would completely stand in the way of the interpretation which they put on their quotation. " Infidelity, or difference of religion, does not make void the magistrate's just and legal authority, nor free the people from their due obedience to him ; from which ecclesiastical persons are not excepted." It is not for a moment to be supposed, that the framers of this confession meant to

say that an infidel or a heretic must be obeyed, if he attempt to settle ordinances of worship, or determine questions of faith. The *government* of the church appointed by Jesus Christ the king and head of the church, is declared in the 30th chapter, to be in the hand of church officers *distinct from the civil magistrate*; and the first chapter of the secoud book of Discipline has still more exactly defined the separate functions of the magistrate and the minister. It is indeed the right and duty of the king and all other magistrates, to preserve the purity of the gospel and the general interests of religion; but the magistrate is not the only person who possesses this *right*, any more than he is the only person bound to this *duty*, which is more specially committed to the spiritual office-bearers.*

The respondents in page 34, &c. dispute Blackstone's opinion as to the right of the crown derived from property. They quote with approbation the opinion of Mr. Justice Yates, who however demolishes one favourite dogma of theirs, that the crown has a right of control over the press. We see no material difference between the opinion of Yates and that of Blackstone (who followed Lord Mansfield,) except this, that Blackstone describes the king's right as not only a right of property, but one which he possesses as head of the church and government, and Yates says that it is only as head of the church and the government that the king possesses the right. Yates's opinion was not found to be correct with regard to one class of books, viz. almanacks, concerning which he had as little doubt as the rest.

* See Appendix.

The respondents say, however, that the maxims of Yates apply to Scotland equally as England; forgetting surely that in England no canon or constitution is valid without the king's ratification, and that he can even make constitutions without the convocation. Even Atterbury admits this, and still more clearly is the fact established by Kennet, Wake, Gibson, and the other writers on ecclesiastical law.

The other opinions quoted, however they may be received in England, can have no weight in Scotland, where the ecclesiastical constitution is so essentially different.

On the sixth branch of the argument (p. 38.) their assertions are not more accurate than on the fifth. The decisions of the privy council scarcely ever sustained the right of the grantee to the extent specified in the gift. But we do not hold the decisions of the privy council to have settled the law of the case. Most of the prohibitory clauses in question, referred to other books than Bibles, and were intended to secure the property of the persons who undertook editions of expensive works. If the right of the crown be as boundless as the respondents assert, it appears to us to involve the right of suppressing the Scriptures altogether.

The presumption, that when importation was not prohibited, it was permitted only under the sanction of the privileged grantee, is quite unsupported by evidence, or even by probability.

On the second branch of the case, the respondents first recite their patent as printers, and secondly their patent as booksellers. With regard to the latter, not one word of it applies to the case of Bibles, unless it might be construed to infer, that if the king, while residing in Scotland, required a Bible,

or if Bibles were wanted for the excise-office, or the post-office, they ought to be supplied by the respondents. We do not believe that the patents would bear them out in any such claim. It would not be found either in England or Scotland, that Mr. Free-ling, who is a great collector, must buy his Bibles, or any other books, from the king's booksellers, and much less can it be found that such of his Majesty's subjects as are not employed in the post-office, or other public offices, must be provided with such articles at the king's warehouse. In their capacity of booksellers they can show no long series of patents. The first commission of this kind was granted by Geo. I. in 1718, to George Redpath and three other persons residing in England, who were thus rewarded for their loyalty and their zeal for the reformed religion and the Protestant succession. We have little doubt that the respondents conceive, that the power of the king is such, that he might have extended their privilege to an exclusive right of selling stationary and books to all the subjects in the realm, and exercising all the other parts of the trade and mystery of booksellers, bookbinders, and stationers. And, to say the truth, we cannot find out any better reason why the lieges should be required universally to supply themselves with Bibles printed by them, (if indeed they be so required,) than why they should purchase all their paper, vellum, wax, quills, and ink, from the king's warehouse.

The printing patent (they say) gives "the office of *king's printer generally*;" but this to our ears is as unintelligible as if they were to say *king's architect generally*, which would be a great office if it involved the sole power of planning and building all churches and chapels, as well as all castles, prisons, bar-

racks, courthouses, and public offices. "Whatever the king's right may be, it is conveyed (they say) in the most ample and unlimited terms to the respondents." If, then, the king's right belong to him as head of the church, does his Majesty constitute Sir David Hunter Blair and Mr. Bruce as heads of the church ? From some of the statements it may be concluded, that his Majesty may appoint an unlimited number either conjunctly or severally. It is not necessary for the king's printers to be of the communion of the church, or of any religious profession ; and they will no doubt say, it is not necessary for the king to be of the communion of this church. This is indeed true ; but for this reason, among many others, the king cannot be head of this church. The church of England, which acknowledges a secular head, does not acknowledge a head who does not join in communion with that church ; and why should things that are incompatible in England be compatible in Scotland ?

The distinction which the respondents attempt to draw between the office of king's printer generally, and the special right of printing the Bible and all privileged books, is to us not very intelligible. The office of *king's printer generally*, reminds us of the ingenious conception of a universal lord mayor in Martinus Scriblerus. Our argument on the discrepancies among the successive grants, did not proceed on the supposition, that the title of king's printer involved any substantial privilege. We rather thought it a mere honorary distinction, such as that of king's apothecary or watchmaker, or tailor, conveying no right except perhaps some trifling immunities annexed to the members of the household. We would just wish to know what is included in the general

idea of a king's printer? The respondents admit, that it does not necessarily involve the right of printing the Bible; and we have seen that it does not necessarily involve the right of printing acts of parliament or proclamations, or any one of all the descriptions of books included in the present licence, or in any former licence. For all of these have been occasionally granted to persons who had not the title of king's printer. If the mere office of *king's printer generally* involves any obligation, it is one of a very indefinite, variable, and fugitive nature, sometimes having nothing to do with sacred books, at other times having nothing to do with law books, and occasionally claiming an exclusive right to all papers, pamphlets, and volumes, from a play bill to a polyglot. The general office then is a mere empty name, and no man can say beforehand what duties are implied in it, and what qualifications are necessary for its proper discharge. The special right again has no foundation that we can see, unless either all printing be *inter regalia*, or at least the printing of certain books be *inter regalia*. But though Bibles, acts of parliament, and a few other books of authority, have formed the whole subject of the grant for a century back, it was not invariably so; and not only is there no evidence of importation of Bibles having been prevented in the 17th century, but it is clear from the terms of the licences to Finlason and Young and Tyler, that importation was not intended to be prohibited; and as Anderson's gift was restrained by the council to the terms of Evan Tyler's, it is plain that whatever other books might be excluded, the Bible was not.

We need not dwell on what is said, p. 42, con-

cerning the jealousy subsisting among the three partners of Freebairn's patent of 1711.

The opinion of Sir James Stewart about the articles of Union and the practice of importation before the Union, is said, (p. 43.) to have been clearly proved to be wrong. Sir James said that importation from England was never prohibited. He ought to have known, for he had some experience both in writing and importing books. No man possessed more minute information concerning the state of the government and the country during the reign of Charles II. Mackenzie speaks of one of the books ascribed to him, (*Jus populi*, the book condemned along with Anderson's New Testament,) as if it contained inflammatory and mischievous expressions which are not to be found in it ; but another of his reputed writings, on account of which he found it prudent to retire from the kingdom, has received from Sir George a high, though not an intentional compliment, in having been transcribed with very few material alterations into his History of Scotland. This was the spirited and unanswerable tract, entitled, "The Account of Scotland's Grievances under the Duke of Lauderdale, 1678." We cannot believe that a man whose intelligence was so extensive and so accurate could have spoken unadvisedly when he said that "for *certain*, the importation of Bibles from England hath not hitherto been prohibited in Scotland, whatever might have been the conception of former gifts." It is to be remarked that Mr. Solicitor-General Kennedy does not affirm that importation from England had been prohibited.

The respondents (p. 45, 46.) deride the opinion, that importation from England was permitted by

Basket and Campbell's patent 1716, with a view to encourage competition between the patentees of England and Scotland.

Their *first* reason for saying that this conjecture is improbable, would not only prevent the English printers from sending Bibles into Scotland, but would prevent the Scottish patentee from licensing importation. We do not see how Bibles imported under his authority, can be more secure from error than those imported by authority of the king himself.

Their *second* reason is intended to be an *argumentum ad absurdum*. They say that "Basket, who was to receive the new gift (of 1716) was at that very time king's printer for England, and farmed the university press. The theory of the petitioners then is, that he having got the entire monopoly of the English market, also obtained the monopoly of the Scottish market by way of establishing a free trade; in other words, that the power of preventing importation from England was struck out of the Scottish patent, in order to confer upon Scotland the boon of a competition between Mr. Basket and himself—to allow his English Bibles to compete with his Scottish Bibles for the purpose of keeping down the price, and securing a due supply; and this, while it is plain that he would have had a reciprocal power of licensing importation in both countries, although his patent had been as exclusive as Freebairn's. The history of the petitioners would certainly require some external aid to fortify it, for it has not the merit of possessing any internal evidence of probability or consistency."

If the facts be as they are here stated, that Basket had the entire monopoly of the English market,

and also of the Scottish market ; and if the crown was aware of the fact after the last of the gifts had been conferred, probably *per incuriam*, it appears to us to have become doubly necessary in the case of the patent for Scotland, that a clause should be introduced for the purpose of preventing future patentees (whose grants would probably be formed on the model of that which was about to expire) from claiming such an extensive right as might have terminated in a perpetual monopoly in a kingdom where no such permanent bodies as the universities enjoyed the concurrent privilege of printing Bibles.

But the history of the case of Basket is very incompletely stated by the respondents. We do not know how he insured the monopoly of the English market by “farming the university press” of Oxford, or rather by farming a single division of it for the term of twenty years. We suppose the university of Cambridge could print Bibles ; for we trust it will not be said that they surrendered their right to Basket. But even if it were true that Basket had the monopoly in England during the greater part of the time when he had also a privilege of printing in Scotland, it is certain that he had not the monopoly in Scotland during any part of that time. In the patent 1711 he had only a third share. For more than forty years after that period Watson and his assignees printed Bibles and acts of parliament ; and so did Freebairn and his assignees. In the patent 1716, Basket had a partner, and we believe that in the right of that partner another person printed Bibles and acts of parliament till the year 1757.

There were then three or four contemporary prin-

ters while Basket held his office in Scotland. And during the whole of that term we think there were always three offices in Edinburgh where Bibles were printed. Watson printed a great number of excellent editions in all sizes, folio, quarto, octavo, twelves, and twenty-fours, from 1713 to 1723.

In 1724 Mosman and Brown succeeded as assigns of the deceased James Watson, and continued to print Bibles, &c. for some years. From 1727 we find Robert Freebairn printing many editions of the Bible, &c. some very indifferently, and others very well.

In 1736, 1737, and 1738, we find sometimes John Nairn, sometimes James Blair, and sometimes Blair and Nairn jointly printing Bibles and Prayer Books. Freebairn's right was adjudged to Nairn in 1737; but before this time Blair and Nairn printed Bibles. We do not think Freebairn ever ceased to exercise the office in person, at least his name appears on Bibles in 1736, the same year with Blair and Nairn.* We do not recollect the exact time when Watkins began, or in whose right; but from 1739 to 1756 we find almost every year the names of Freebairn, of Watkins, and of Basket, all printing separately; for the same act of parliament is occasionally printed by them all.

One circumstance connected with these Bibles deserves to be noticed. All the Bibles, we think, which were printed in octavo or quarto by Basket or by Freebairn, or by Blair and Nairn, and some of the size of twelves, had the marginal notes and

* A collection of British Statutes from the time of the Union was begun by Watson in 1718, and carried on through a few volumes. Brown and Mosman carried it on from 1725, R. Freebairn from 1730, and Adrian Watkins from 1748 to 1755. From the year 1740 to 1756, single acts are found printed by Freebairn, by Basket, by Richard Watkins, and then by Adrian Watkins.

references of the early English editions, very few in number. But the octavo editions, and some of the *twelves* (we are not so sure of the quarto) printed by Brown and Mosman, and by Watkins, had a much more numerous set of references, chiefly taken from John Canne, whose Bibles printed in England and in Holland, were always favourites with the people of Scotland.* At that time the competition certainly produced variety, as well as cheapness. There has not been a tolerable edition of a Bible with Canne's references (much as it is in demand) for more than fifty years; that which was printed by M. and C. Kerr in 1796 is scarcely legible, and the edition is not yet exhausted. The present patentees have never printed it.

Now though Basket in Scotland would not have felt any great inducement to outdo his own performances in England, it is very plain that the importation of Bibles from England must have stimulated Watson, Freebairn, Watkins and others, to aim at a higher degree of excellence than any one of them would have felt to be necessary if he had been secured from all rivalry. It is very evident that Basket's interest would not lead him to try the question of his right to exclude from Scotland Bi-

* Mosman and Brown, in their edition 1727, have inserted the following note after John Canne's preface:

“N. B. There are in this edition of the Holy Bible, *several thousands* of errors amended and corrected in the notes on the Old Testament, which were in all or most of the editions, whether printed at Edinburgh or elsewhere. It was the labour of a judicious gentleman for several years at his leisure hours, who was so kind as to make us the offer of them, which we accepted.

As for the notes on the New Testament, we were recommended by a learned and worthy gentleman our very good friend, to make choice of those subjoined to Wetstein's edition of his Greek New Testament, printed anno 1711, as the most copious and best extant.”

bles printed in England. But there were other parties who had such an interest during the 40 years or more of his continuance in his office in Scotland. Surely Freebairn, even if his interest had not been concerned, might have felt disposed to humble the person who had attempted to deprive him of the patent 1711; but Watson must have felt much more inclined to do it if it had been practicable. Basket had prosecuted him in the English courts, and had succeeded in excluding Watson's Bibles from England. Watson lost a great sum by this action; and in a paper which he printed on the subject in 1720, he signified his purpose to make reprisals on Basket if he should lose the cause in the House of Lords, as he seemed to anticipate. But he was better advised. There is no trace of any attempt on his part to keep Basket's English Bibles out of the Scottish market. His successors, Brown and Mosman, appear to have inherited his hostility to Basket; and it is not to be supposed that they would have let him alone if they had entertained any hope of being able to exclude him. In 1725, they attempted to stop his press in Edinburgh, on the ground that he had not taken the *oath of abjuration* within the time limited by law. But Basket proved to the satisfaction of the court that he was not bound to take this oath, as he was not one of the persons described in the act 1693, as being obliged to take the oaths of *allegiance* and the *assurance*. When the Court of Session found that the king's printer was not obliged to take the oaths, is it not wonderful that Watson and Freebairn did not at least try to exclude Basket's Bibles printed in England, especially as their patent was that of 1711, which excludes Bibles from England as much as

from France or Holland? It will be said, that, in spite of their opposition, Basket might have licensed the importation of his own Bibles printed in England. But we deny that he was entitled to do this without the consent of the other patentees, any more than Mr. Strahan would have been entitled to license the importation of Edinburgh Bibles into England, if the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge felt it, or conceived it to be injurious to their interests. The Scottish printers were aware that they could not stop importation, and Basket, besides printing the more ordinary editions in Edinburgh, where labour was then, as it is still, much cheaper than in England, had all along the advantage of sending his finer Bibles down from London or from Oxford, without any opposition.

So far as the people of Scotland were concerned, they must have found that, for ordinary purposes, the necessity of importation was in a great degree superseded by the number of editions published at the rival presses. "A competition between Basket and himself" would not have been any great satisfaction to them, but better Bibles than Basket's were at that time printed in this country by persons who were always at variance with him. All this time, too, the New Testament was printed at Glasgow, and elsewhere, by a multitude of printers. And as to all the other books called prerogative books, scarcely a year elapsed in which there were not editions of the Confession of Faith, the Psalms and the Catechisms, printed by various printers in Edinburgh, Glasgow, and elsewhere;—many of them much superior to any that have ever been printed by the king's printer to this hour, if we except only

Watson's Collection of Confessions in 1719 and 1722; and even this edition was never completed.

Some of these remarks are intended less as an answer to the second observation of the respondents, (p. 45, 46,) than to show how little force there is in their *first* remark *on usage*, p. 59.

To their third observation, p. 46, we have merely to say that the clause *cum omnibus perquisitis, &c.* is the very same in substance as the clause in *Young and Tyler's* patent 1641, (each of them containing the words *privilegiis, immunitatibus, emolumentis*, and the patent 1641, containing the words *libertatibus, proficuis, feodis, et casualitatibus* instead of *perquisitis, et exemptionibus* in the patent of the respondents. Some of the other expressions in the patent 1641, are stronger than in theirs. Yet Young and Tyler were not allowed to exclude Bibles from England, or even to prevent the printing of Bibles in folio, or of the Psalms and New Testament. And Anderson's patent was afterwards limited to the conditions of Tyler's; so that nothing can be more manifest than that the clause *cum omnibus perquisitis, &c.* gives the respondents no more power than was given to Young and Tyler.

The remark, p. 48, on the clause in the patent of the English king's printers, prohibiting importation from foreign parts out of that part of Great Britain called England, requires only one observation. The dispute in the case of Richardson, they say, was not with the king's printer, but with the Universities; and on inquiring into the terms of *their* authority, the respondents conclude that their own right is stronger than that of the English Universities; and

as the Universities succeeded in excluding these Bibles from England, the respondents ought to succeed in excluding the University Bibles from Scotland. Now, will any one say that if the king's printer in England had not been entitled to exclude the Bibles printed in Scotland, the Universities would have been found to have that title? They had been found long before to possess a right in all respects equal to that of the king's printer in England; and if he had the right of excluding importation, it is impossible to deny that they must have possessed it too; otherwise it might have been in his power to secure great profit to himself by licensing the importation of Scottish Bibles, while he never printed any Bibles at all. It was clearly established in Richardson's case that the king's printer in England had avowedly exercised the right of restraining the king's printer in Scotland from importing his books into England, ever since the year 1717.

In p. 54 they say that "the right of sale, conferred by some of the old Scottish grants, truly meant a strict monopoly to the donees; that no other shop could sell but theirs." We do not know that this ever applied to Bibles; but we are sure that there was no time when other shops did not sell.

There is a very incorrect assertion in p. 55 about the time when the English liturgy belonged as much to Scotland as to England. There never was such a time. For a year or two the English service was attempted in Holyrood-house. The service of the Church of Rome was performed still longer in the same chapel; and on as good grounds the respondents might print the breviaries and missals of that church.

The respondents say (p. 56) that we maintain a fallacy in stating that if our claim were sustained, the only effect would be to permit the importation of Bibles “printed by the authorised patentees in England.” In answer to this they tell us *first* that the English patentees are *aliens* to this country, as much unauthorised by the crown of Scotland as any subjects of a foreign state. We must say in reply, that the translation itself is alien, as unauthorised by the church and the legislature of Scotland as the Bibles of Holland, Germany, or Switzerland. The only authority which can be pleaded for its prevalence is usage; and the same authority of usage entitles the people of Scotland to supply themselves from England as much as they find for their convenience, satisfaction, and interest. If we set aside usage, the authority for using the Geneva Bible is stronger and more direct than that for King James’s Bible—as this was the translation which was not only named in the earliest patents mentioning the Bible, but also expressly allowed by the church, and it has never yet been disallowed. How do the respondents venture to print the Bible with Blaney’s references? These are altogether of English origin; and for any thing which we know, they may tend to introduce doctrines inconsistent with the standards of our national church, and at variance with the principles of the majority of the people of Scotland. That they have such a tendency in some instances, we have good reason for affirming; and many of the authorities to which they refer, as if they were canonical Scripture, are altogether disclaimed by the church of Scotland, and by almost every class of Dissenters. We allude to the books

of Apocrypha, which are declared, in the Confession of Faith, to be “not of divine inspiration, and of no authority in the church of God;” and of which books the Directory for public worship prohibits any part to be read in the church. How is it that such respect is paid to these references by the king’s printers, though they are altogether alien? And how is it that they are so servilely attached to an alien translation as to include in their editions of a large size a series of uncanonical books, which to a certain extent in England are *appointed to be read in churches*, but which in Scotland are *prohibited to be read in churches*? From all that we have now said, our conclusion is that no harm surely can ensue from using the Bibles printed by the *alien patentees* in England, so long as our own printers furnish us with Bibles, the chief recommendation of which, according to their own showing, is their entire conformity with the favourite editions of these same alien patentees. If it be said, why should we contend for the importation of Bibles containing notes and references which many of us disapprove? our answer to this is, we may have good reasons for wishing to possess copies even of the corrupt editions of the Scriptures; but this is not our plea. We can import from England Bibles of almost every size from the smallest up to quarto, without any notes or references at all; and in Scotland, so far as we know, there never have been any copies of the Bible printed without references, except in such small sizes of letter as can scarcely be read by people advanced in years. The *second* answer of the respondents concerning this matter is, that if they cannot exclude Bibles printed by the

English patentees, neither can they exclude Bibles printed by others in England. They then make a supposition the most extravagant possible, that any person in England may make an arrangement with the English patentees, to be allowed to print for Scotland, and then they may inundate Scotland with the most improper and inaccurate editions of the Bible. How is it conceivable that the English patentees would do this to the manifest injury of their own traffic? How could it be worth any one's while to run the risk of printing Bibles so improper and inaccurate as probably to be unsaleable, especially when the king's printers can furnish them so cheap? How could private individuals do it who have to pay the duty on paper, from which we believe all the patentees are exempted? The amount of this saving to the privileged printers must be very considerable on a large edition. The drawback allowed to Cambridge from 1809 to 1815 was L.13,072; and to Oxford for the same seven years, L.18,658. The proportion in both cases paid for Bibles, Testaments, &c. must have been nine times more than for all other books. The total value of the Bibles, and other prerogative books, printed at Cambridge, in that period, was L.149,050; and the total value of other books distinguished from Bibles, Testaments, and prayer-books, was L.16,993, 15s. At Oxford, in the same period, the total value of the Bibles, prayer-books, and psalms, was L.212,917; and the total value of all the other books was L.24,776. In the one case the average saving to the University was nearly L.2000 a year, and in the other nearly L.3000. Such an advantage as this must make it no easy matter for persons, who must pay the duty, to undersell the king's printers, even if it were conceivable that the two Universities and

the king's printer for England were to conspire to ruin the Scottish patentees in a manner not only discreditable, but manifestly injurious to themselves.

We do not subscribe to the opinion of the respondents that, in the case of the Bible, competition has not the effect of reducing the price, and improving the quality. They seem to admit that Bibles for the rich, who can afford a high price, might be as good, if competition were allowed. But not so (they say) in the case of the poor; for whose use, they allege, that the works ordinarily printed are as defective in accuracy as in appearance. They then assert that they bring copies much cheaper into the market than could possibly be offered in a free trade. We are not printers, and have no wish to diminish their profits. We say, however, and we can prove by ocular demonstration, that their common Bibles, when the Edinburgh Bible Society was formed in 1809, were as defective in appearance as the meanest of the books ordinarily printed for the poor. We have not proposed that the trade should be thrown open; but if it were, we do not see that any evils would result from it, or even that any loss could be incurred by the king's printers, so long as they have the benefit of the drawback on paper, and other immunities and advantages which are not inconsiderable. The demand for the Greek New Testament is many hundreds of times less than the demand for the Bible in English, and it is much more difficult and more expensive to print it accurately; and yet many printers in Scotland, as well as in England, have ventured to print editions of it, which they have disposed of at very moderate prices; and we are not aware that there ever has been ground for complaining that the text has been in any material

respect corrupted, in consequence of the complete openness of the trade.* While the catechism was printed by every body who chose, it was in general as correctly printed as it is now, and it was sold at one-half the price which it now costs.†

The respondents (p. 58.) take advantage of a casual expression in our petition, in which we disclaimed any wish to deprive them of the exclusive right of printing Bibles, and expressed an opinion which they have rendered unintelligible by misprinting it. Our counsel stated in our name, that we think it desirable that the printing (not the *purity*) of the Bible should not be intrusted to every person who might choose to undertake it; but that it should be put under the charge of responsible individuals. As members of Bible Societies, and as individuals too, we certainly think that it would be a great loss to this part of the kingdom if the king's printers were to cease to find it for their interest to print editions of the Scriptures, and we would rejoice to know that the demand for their editions increases progressively year after year, in consequence of their increasing excellence. We have no wish whatever that the Bibles printed in England shall be more in demand than those which are printed here. But, at the same time, we must express our mature and deliberate conviction that the purity of the faith is no more likely to be cor-

* The most incorrect edition of the Greek New Testament which we ever saw was printed by one of the patentees of the office of King's Printer in England in 1803. Surely he was under no necessity of printing incorrectly because he had no monopoly in this case. So it is, that we know of no such blunders in any edition by unprivileged printers,

† We have mentioned in the Appendix a few editions of the Catechism in our possession, some of which are very superior in appearance to any of those which we have seen by the king's printers for Scotland.

rupted by the removal of all restrictions on printing the Scriptures in our native language, than by the universal liberty of printing them in the original tongues and in new translations. The national church of Scotland (of which many of us are members) does not consider any translation as the infallible rule of faith, but has stated as a fundamental point of doctrine, that “the Old Testament in Hebrew, and the New Testament in Greek, being immediately inspired by God, and by his singular care and providence kept pure in all ages, are therefore *authentical*: so as in all controversies of religion, the church is finally to appeal unto them.” And great as is our reverence for the volume which contains the substance of divine truth in the tongue most familiar to our ears, we feel a much deeper veneration for the express words of inspiration; and knowing that on the whole these words have been preserved pure and entire through many generations of gross darkness and superstition, in spite of the carelessness and ignorance of transcribers, and the hostility of infidels and heretics, we are not apprehensive of any ultimate danger either from the freedom or the restrictions of the press.

We absolutely and utterly deny the position which the respondents maintain, “that, to insure accuracy, the power of excluding importation from abroad is as necessary as the power of excluding printing at home.” But we are not by any means to be understood ever to have admitted that the printing at home ought to be confided to one individual, or to one company.

What is said by the respondents (p. 58.) concerning the variety of their editions, we have already shown to be erroneous. They say that there are a

very few editions printed in England for which there is no demand in Scotland, and which therefore they do not print. We say that there are three times as many varieties printed in England as in Scotland ; and that for some of them there is a very considerable demand, particularly for *octavo* editions without references, and for smaller sizes of Bibles in a larger type than is ever used here, either for Bibles in twelves, eighteens, or twenty-fours.

The redress to which they refer us in page 58, if the monopoly should produce inaccuracy or excessive price, or deficient supply, is one of which those who feel the greatest interest in the matter may not find it very easy to avail themselves. We do not ourselves know in what way it would be practicable to compel the respondents to perform their duty in such a way as would be altogether satisfactory. It would be no satisfaction to us that they were duly censured, or their gift withdrawn, if others might be appointed (as has hitherto been generally the case) without any possibility of knowing the qualifications of the patentees before they began to exercise them. Much would depend on the ministers of the crown for the time. We know that a short time before the lamented death of Mr. Perceval, when a new patent was about to be issued for the office of printer general for Ireland, he signified his determination to have the grant so worded as not to impede the operations of the British and Foreign Bible Society in Ireland, and accordingly a clause was inserted to prevent the exclusion of Bibles and New Testaments printed by either of the English universities.* The patent also gave a concur-

* "In the month of October, 1810, by Mr. Perceval's desire Mr. Owen and Mr. Hughes had an interview with him in Downing Street

ring right to Trinity College, Dublin, of Bibles and all other books used in divine service ; so that the people of Ireland have now four sources from which they can be supplied with Bibles, besides the king's printers in Scotland, who, without any right recognised in the patent to Mr. Grierson, are said to sell vast numbers, particularly in the north of Ireland. In this respect Ireland has been particularly favoured by the British government. That country was originally supplied by importation. A patent granted by James I. to John Francton about the year 1610 was indeed very exclusive, prohibiting all printing, binding, publishing or selling of Bibles and other books, except by Francton, under severe penalties. It is believed, however, that the terms of this grant were not rigidly enforced ; and the patents granted by King William and George II. were much more favourable to the people. The patent to Boulter Grierson granted by Geo. III. constituted him sole printer general in Ireland, with all profits, commodities, advantages, pre-eminencies and privileges thereunto belonging, and prohibiting all printing of Bibles, &c. by any others within the kingdom, but at the same time providing that this

when they were interrogated, whether the patent of the king's printer, then on the eve of being renewed, occasioned any obstruction to the circulation of the Scriptures in Ireland, through the medium of the British and Foreign Bible Society. After expressing his friendship for the society, Mr. Perceval dismissed the secretaries with an assurance, that nothing should be allowed to enter into the patent, upon its renewal, which might be likely to interfere with the useful plans of the Society." Owen's Hist. of the British and Foreign Bible Society, vol. ii. p. 299. See three Irish patents in Appendix, No. xxxix. &c. Also the case of *Grierson* against *Jackson*, p. 112, &c. It is said that the king's printers for Scotland still import vast numbers of Bibles into Ireland, but it is not known that any are imported from Ireland into Scotland. The Irish may thus be supplied from five sources, while Scotland is expected to be content with one.

grant shall not be repugnant to any grant made by the king or any of his progenitors to any of his printers in Great Britain. Here importation was evidently allowed ; but the reservation of a concurrent right of printing Bibles and other books used in divine service, to the Provost, Fellows, and Scholars of Trinity College, was assuredly an additional boon to Ireland ; and this boon, as well as the liberty of importing Bibles and New Testaments printed at the university presses in England, was bestowed in the patent 1811. Did this injure the patentee, or did it endanger the purity of the text ? It did neither. The people are supplied with Bibles of good quality at a cheap rate ; and as the demand for Bibles has prodigiously increased, the Printer-general sees it to be his interest to print Bibles, (a thing which he did to a very small extent before,) and certainly prints them better than ever. The patent thus granted to a printer in Ireland fifteen years ago expresses, we have no doubt, what has always been the intention of government since the Revolution, that the people in every part of his Majesty's dominions might, if they wished it, be supplied from more sources than one. Is Scotland to be the only part of the three kingdoms in which a monopoly of Bibles must now be introduced after an unlimited practice of importation from the very dawn of the Reformation ? And why should his Majesty's printers for Scotland, who, according to their own doctrine, are not amenable to the laws of Ireland, take upon them to inundate that kingdom with books, which in their language are *unauthentic* ? And must it depend on the religious character and views of the individual who is minister of the crown when a patent is renewed, whether the *word of God is to have free course*, or whether the

word of God is to be bound by the restrictions of a monopoly, which, even if it had not fallen into long disuse, is certainly repugnant to the most just and liberal notions of constitutional law ?

Usage, we maintain, is entirely in our favour. We hold it to be established, that long before the time of Basket, (to whom reference is made, p. 59.) the right of importing Bibles from England had been established by uninterrupted usage. From 1542 to 1579, the people of Scotland had Bibles supplied to them by importation alone ; from 1579 to 1610, as they had only one edition in folio, printed chiefly for the use of churches, they must have been supplied with imported Bibles for ordinary reading ; from 1610 to 1633, only one edition of the Bible has ever been discovered, and that edition could not be much more than sufficient for the supply of churches. From 1612 to 1632, the Bible was excepted from the gift of the king's printer in the prohibitory clause, and thus others were allowed to print and import it. The same must evidently have been the terms of the patent to Robert Young in 1632, as appears from the joint gift to Young and Tyler in 1641, which reserves to any other printer in Scotland the right of printing the Bible in folio. So also in that patent, the printers of Scotland had a common right of printing Psalms, Testaments, and other books for the church of Scotland, and the patentee had no power of excluding foreign Bibles, except from France, Holland, or other places beyond seas. Anderson's grant in 1671 was made subject to the orders of the privy council, and the privy council restricted it to the style, tenor, and books named in Evan Tyler's gift,—a gift under which importation of any books from England was evidently free, and

under which certain sizes and parts of the Bible might be printed by all and sundry. We have also the uncontradicted evidence of Sir James Stewart in 1711, that the importation of Bibles had not hitherto been prohibited in Scotland, whatever might have been the conception of former gifts. And then we have the forty-one years of Freebairn's patent, and four or five years more of Basket's, during which, even if there had been no importation, the people would not have been exposed to the danger of a monopoly, as there were during almost the whole of that time three distinct printing offices in Edinburgh, and never fewer than two, at which Bibles were printed, and during all that time, Psalms, New Testaments, Confessions, and Catechisms were printed by any one who pleased, as they had been in Anderson's time. The respondents speak of the right of the crown not being compromised by the act of temporary patentees, and of the country neither gaining nor losing any right under such a practice. We hold that the right of the country is not a right to exclude importation, but a right to import; and it cannot be at this time of day considered as the right of the crown to abridge the long-possessed privileges of the people. If the right of the crown cannot be lost by usage, may the crown now resume all the powers supposed to be recognised in the act 1551? If printing be *inter regalia*, can the king renounce this privilege of the crown?

The toleration of importation, say the respondents, (p. 59.) was mutual between both countries during the whole of last century, and even later; at least as many copies having been sent from Scotland to England as from England into Scotland.

“ This, they say, was in virtue of a mutual voluntary toleration, which would never establish a prescriptive usage ; but if it did so, it must be on both sides or on neither. Yet it was held in the case of Richardson that no such right was established against the English patentees.” Let us observe the difference of the two cases. In 1717, the highest court of law in England had found that the king’s printer for England had a right to exclude Bibles printed in Scotland. If during the next forty years any Bibles were sent from Scotland into England, they could only be Basket’s own. Now, with regard to the usage from 1757 to 1802, no doubt it was averred by Richardson that he had been a bookseller in London forty years, and that during the whole of that time, and many years previous, books had been reciprocally sent into and from England and Scotland. But on this part of the answer, the Lord Chancellor said, “ I take the answer to this purpose to be not strictly true.” Besides, though the Lord Chancellor did not receive the affidavits which were offered, two booksellers who at the time sold more books than any persons in their trade, Mr. Robinson and Mr. Johnson (who had been in business between forty and fifty years,) declared that they never sold these books printed in Scotland. It was not admitted by Mr. Mansfield, (counsel for the universities,) that the usage of bringing Bibles from Scotland into England had prevailed for forty years. The usage, he said, could not have prevailed till the decision in the case of Basket against Parsons had been forgotten. The usage too, he states, had not been public, but clandestine and illicit. On this subject the Lord Chancellor

said, “ If I find there is a decision that the usage is against law, even if the usage was stronger than I think it can be pretended to be upon this answer, it would not authorise me to declare that that which was three times declared to be law, about 1718 or 1720, has ceased to be law, and has given way to usage. *This might be contended in Scotland, where law goes into desuetude*; an idea that we do not understand here; but I do not think it can be contended in England. We might have the advantage, perhaps, if arguing this question before the Court of Session, we Englishmen over the Scotch printers; but in this country there is no such thing as law going into desuetude.”

The allegation with regard to usage may be tried by a very satisfactory test. If there has been fair, open, and honourable usage in the importation of Bibles from Scotland into England, then we may expect to find that the catalogues of the principal English booksellers who dealt in theological books during the last century, will contain as large a proportion of Bibles printed in Edinburgh, as the catalogues of Scottish booksellers of the same period contain of Bibles printed in England. Now we have examined nearly forty Edinburgh catalogues from A. Donaldson’s in 1761, to the year 1802, including those of Bell, Balfour, Dickson, Gordon and Murray, Creech, Gray, Elliot, Laing, Fairbairn, Duncan, and Constable; and in these we find in general at least as many Bibles printed in England as in Scotland.* We leave it to the op-

* The following specimen from a few Edinburgh catalogues will show something like the proportion of Scottish to English editions sold in Scotland:—

posite party to point out the same thing in English catalogues, and if they can, they must be more successful in their search than we have been.

Alex. Donaldson, 1761.

A fine Oxford Bible, with Apocrypha, 4to, Edin. 4to Bible, 1756, fine.

Gray, 1787.

Bible, 4to, Camb. 1633—ditto Camb. 1639—4to, Lond. 1577.

Charles Elliot, 1778.

Bible, fol. Baskerville, Birm. 1769—fol. Edin. 1776—4to, large type, Oxf. 1772—4to, large type, Camb. 1775—4to, large type, Camb. 1773—4to, large type, Edin. 1769—8vo, Edin. 1726—ditto, 1770, printed by M'Farquhar—8vo, Lond. 1660—Lond. 1710—Lond. 1693—Oxf. 1764—Oxf. 1770—Camb. 1764—Lond. Eyre & Strachan, 1772, many copies—Edin. 1772.

W. Creech, 1787.

Bible, fol. Lon d. 1777—Watson, Edin. 1726—4to, Oxford, 1769—Camb. 1762—Basket, Lond. 1765—Kincaid, 1762, 1769, and 1775—12mo, Oxf. 1784—Edin. 1774.

Aaron Maule's Books, sold 1782.

Bible, fol. Watson, Edin. 1722—fol. Ostervald, (M'Farquhar) Edin. 1776—quarto, Coverdale's, Lond.—quarto, Bill, Lond. 1693.

Books of Rev. R. Kinloch, one of the Ministers of Edinburgh, sold in 1783.

Bible, quarto, large print, by Bill, Lond. 1702—quarto, by Anderson, in. 1678—Confession of Faith, 1st and 2d Book of Discipline, &c. Lond. 1612—Confession of Faith, with Scriptures at large, Lond. 1675.

James Dickson, 1779.

Bible, Baskerville, fol. Birming. 1769—Ostervald's (not by K. Printers) Edin. 1776—4to, by Field, Camb. 1666—4to, by Basket, Lond. 1767—4to, by Basket, Lond. 1767—4to, Kincaid, Edin. 1775—4to, Eyre & Strahan's fine ditto, Lond. 1772.

Gordon & Murray, 1782, containing the books of Gordon of Gordonston, and Dr. George Wishart.

Fol. Bible, Bassandyne, Edin. 1576—fol. with Apocrypha, Lond. 1679—fol. with Notes, Aberd. 1769—fol. And. Hart, Edin. 1610—4to, Field, 3 copies, Camb. 1666—4to, Norton & Bill, Lond. 1622—4to, Barker, Lond. 1613—4to, Kincaid, Edin. 1775—royal 4to, 2 vols. (standard edition) Oxf. 1769.

John Bell, 1781.

Bible, Eyre & Strahan, 4to, Lond. 1778—Kincaid, 4to, Edin. 1775—

Let them also look through the churches in Scotland. They will find, particularly in towns,

8vo, Kincaid, Edin. 1772—8vo, Basket, Oxf.—12mo. three Edinburgh editions, one Cambridge, and three London.

Fairbairn, 1794.

4to. Edin. 1787—Camb. 1768 and 1788—Oxf. 1790—8vo, Oxf. 1786—Lond. 1773—Edin. 1789 and 1791.

Elphinstone Balfour, 1787.

Bible, fol. Baskerville, Camb. 1763—fol. Basket, Lond. 1769—4to. Field, 3 copies, Camb. 1668—4to, Basket, Edin. 1726—4to, Barker, Lond. 1615—4to, royal, Lond. 1773—4to, medium, Lond. 1773—8vo, Lond. 1735—8vo, Lond. 1641—8vo, by Cann, 2 vols. Lond. 1647—8vo, Camb. 1765—12mo, Camb. 1778.

Spottiswood's Catalogue of the books of Professor Moor, of Glasgow, 1779.

Bible, fol. Matthews and Tyndal, Lond.—quarto, Barker, Lond. 1599.

Bibles which belonged to the late Mr. Charles Macky, Professor of History in Edinburgh from 1719 to 1765.

Bible, quarto, Barker, Lond. 1599—quarto, Lond. 1648—8vo, Lond. 1639—8vo, Lond. 1679—8vo, Lond. 1694—12mo. Field, 1653.

Bibles which belonged to the late Mr. Stewart of Spoutwells.

32 copies, all printed before 1790—only 4 printed in Edinburgh, including 2 copies of Bassandyne's, the other 28 printed in England, except 2 on the continent.

Bell and Bradfute, 1794, 1798.

Bible, by Eyre & Strahan, royal fol. Lond. 1772—fol. by Barker, Lond. 1602—fol. Edin. 1793—fol. with Notes, Lond. 1795—4to, Lond. 1767—4to, fine paper, Edin. 1789—4to, Lond. 1772—4to, by Field, Lond. 1668—4to, by Basket, Lond. 1767—4to, Camb. 1769—4to, royal, Camb. 1768—4to, with Apocrypha and Common Prayer, Edin. 1752—4to, Edin. 1726—4to, Edin. 1793—4to, Edin. 1791—4to, Brown's, Lond. 1791—4to, Ostervald's, Edin. 1797—4to, Edin. 1796—8vo, Bowyer's Unique Cabinet Bible, printed by Bensley, Lond. 1795—12mo, Bowyer, Lond. 1796—A great variety of Cambridge, Oxford, and Edinburgh Bibles, 12mo.

Creech, 1782.

Bible, fol. with Rider's notes, Lond. 1770—fol. with notes, Aberd. 1769—fol. Ostervald, Edin. 1772—4to, Lond. 1766—4to, Royal, Oxf. 1769—4to, Oxf. 1773—4to, Camb. 1762—4to, Kincaid, Edin. 1762—4to, Kincaid, 1769—8vo, Edin. 1777—8vo, Lond. 1772—8vo, with Cann's Notes, Edin. 1774.

great numbers of Bibles printed in Oxford, Cambridge, and London, used in the pulpits, and in the

Bible, by Walley, fol. 1575—old edition, fol. 1539—Cranmer's, fol. Lond. 1583—printed by Field, 4to, 1668—by Basket, 4to, 1726—Camb. 1786—by Barker, 4to, Lond. 1616.

J. & E. Balfour, 1784.

Bible, 4to, Lond. 1773—Lond. 1772—8vo, Lond. 1772—Camb. 1773—Lond. 1774—Lond. 1776.

Laing, 1800.

Bible, large type, by Field, fol. Camb. 1660—Baskerville, fol. Camb. 1763—8vo, Lond. 1793.

Constable, 1796.

Bible, fol. superb edition, Lond. 1772—8vo, a great variety, Lond. and Edin. 12mo, Scatcherd, and Whitaker, Lond. 1791.

Constable, 1797.

Bible, fol. Lond. 1772—Lond. 1793—Edin. 1579.

Constable, 1799.

Bible, fol. Lond. 1794—Lond. 1772—Edin. 1796—8vo, Lond. 1774—12mo. Camb. 1653—Pasham, Lond. 1776—Strahan, Lond. 1791—Watson, Edin. 1719—Pine, Bristol, 1774—Canne's Notes, Edin. 1797.

Constable, 1801.

Bible, fol. Oxf. 1717—Lond. 1607—Lond. 1613—4to, Edin. 1796—Lond. 1613—8vo, Lond. 1774—12mo, Camb. 1653—Lond. 1791—Bristol, 1774.

The proportion of Bibles printed in Scotland, observable in the catalogues of English booksellers of the last century, is exceedingly small. The following specimen is taken at random.

Osborne's Catalogue of the libraries of Dr. Mortimer, Mr. Pargiter, Dr. Foster, Counsellor Hamilton and others, 2 vols. 8vo. containing 39,509 books.—Lond. 1754.

23 folio English Bibles.—Oxf. Lond. Camb. Geneva, Amst.—(Not one Edinburgh.)—18 quarto Bibles, do.—Oxf. Lond. Camb.—(None Edinburgh.)—8 octavo Bibles, do.—(One Edinburgh, 1649.)

Robson's Catalogue of the libraries of Richard Long, Esq. and others. 9 folio editions of the Bible, Lond. Camb. and Oxf.—(None Edinburgh.)

10 quarto editions, Lond. Camb. and Oxf.—(None Edinburgh.)—6 octavo editions, Lond. Camb. and Oxf.—(None Edinburgh.)

5 12mo. editions, Lond. Camb. and Oxf.—(One Edinburgh, 1764.)

seats of public bodies. Will they find in London, or Oxford, or Cambridge, that the Scriptures and the liturgy have been read in the service of the church from editions printed by any of the predecessors of the respondents? Within the last month we have made some inquiry into this matter, by writing letters to the places where Bible Societies are established. The returns have not hitherto been numerous ; but the result of the inquiry, so far as it has proceeded, is, that of 320 bibles, reported as being used in the established churches, and other places of worship, by the ministers, elders, and public functionaries occupying official seats, 144 have been printed in Edinburgh, and the remaining 176 almost entirely in England,—a very few of the oldest having been imported from Holland. It appears also that a very great proportion

Paterson's Catalogue of above 8000 books, Lond. 1786.

Bible, Lond. 1646.—Camb. 1648, (4 copies.)—Lond. 1650, Lond. 1698, (9 copies.)

Tesseymann's Catalogue of upwards of 40,000 volumes, York, 1781.

11 editions of the Bible in folio—Lond. 1602, 1607, 1613, 1640, 1763, 1774.—Oxford 1680 and 1770—Camb. 1638 and 1762.

9 Editions in 4to. Camb. Oxf. and Lond. (one Edinb. 1775.)

Robson's Catalogue of 8655 books, Lond. 1784.

10 Bibles in folio, Lond. 1611, 1613.—Camb. 1638 (2 copies.)—Camb. 1659, Camb. 1762.—Oxf. 1685, 1717, 1769.—Birm. 1772.

11 Bibles, 4to. Geneva, 1589—Lond. 1599, 1683, 1677.—Camb. 1666, 1745, 1769, &c.—Oxf. 1747, 1773, &c.—No Edinburgh editions.

Robson's Catalogue of 7468 books, Lond. 1783.

8 folio Bibles, Lond. 1611, 1613.—Oxf. 1717, 1773.—Camb. 1638, 1669, &c.—No Edinburgh editions.

White's Library of Sir Richard Jebb and others (above 11,000 books,) Lond. 1778—10 folio Bibles, Camb. Oxf. and Lond.—11 quarto Bibles, Camb. Oxf. and Lond.—5 octavo Bibles, Lond.—No Edinburgh editions.

of the psalm books used in the churches have been printed, not by the patentees, but by other printers in Scotland. We are thus more and more convinced, that, till very lately, Scotland was chiefly supplied from England with editions of the Bible of a large size, particularly those which are *read in churches*; and if we were to add the communications which enumerate copies possessed by private individuals, not only of superior station, but in the middle and lower classes, we would be justified in concluding, that much more than half of the Bibles used in Scottish families during the last century were printed in England.*

With regard to the Bibles used in churches, it can be proved that some of them were imported at the time when the restrictions on importation are understood to have been the greatest. Thus the Bible of the Old Kirk, Edinburgh, was certainly imported in the reign of Charles II. during

* The following may serve as a specimen. They belong to eight families in the small town of Pittenweem,

Bible, with Geneva notes, and Beza's to the New Testament	Lond. 1708
with Edinburgh Psalms	1679
Do.	Lond. 1605
Do.	Amst. 1640
Do.	Camb. 1637
Do.	Lond. 1639
Do. (with Geneva and Beza's notes)	Lond. 1708
Do.	Lond. 1648
Do.	Oxf. 1682
Do.	Oxf. 1733
Do. (New Testament)	Lond. 1733
Do.	Oxf. 1750
Do.	Camb. 1780
Do.	Heptinstall, Lond. 1795

The Bible used in Bishop Low's chapel, Pittenweem, is a folio without date, printed at Oxford, with Edinburgh Psalms, 1679.

The Bible of St. Adrian's Lodge, Pittenweem, Lond. 1599, with Psalms, Edin. 1643.

the currency of Anderson's patent. This Bible was printed at Oxford in 1682, and was presented to the ministers by the elders in 1684.* If it had been an illegal act clandestinely committed, the elders would not have ventured to print an account of their donation, nor would they have ventured to record it, as they did, on the most conspicuous page of the record of their session. The Bible which has long been used in the church of Old Machar, (formerly the Cathedral Church of Aberdeen,) is a large folio, printed at Oxford in 1685, and it appears from an inscription, and from the stamping in gilt letters on the boards, that it was presented by Dr. Fraser, sub-principal of King's College, in 1692. * * * * *

* The following inscription is printed at the beginning of this copy, by Reid, in 1684.

This *BIBLE* was gifted (in Anno 1684) to the Reverend
Mr. ALEXANDER RAMSAY,
and

Mr. JOHN FARQUHAR,
Present Ministers of the *Old Church of Edinburgh*; and
to their Successours in that Church,

By

Mr. $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{William Panton.} \\ \text{John Frank.} \\ \text{Alexander Buchan.} \\ \text{Charles Murray} \end{array} \right\}$ Elders.

The Session Book of the Old Kirk contains the following entry at the commencement of the volume, beginning 1. Jan. 1685.

“ William Panton, Mr. John Frank, Alexander Buchan, and Charles Murray, Elders in the South, or Old Kirk parish, 1684, as a token of their love and observance, to the Reverend Mr. Alexander Ramsay and Mr. John Farquhar, gifted to them or bestowed a large Bible, in folio, well folded and richly bound, and of ane large and excellent character. To be for their and the Church's service upon all occasions.”

ADDITIONAL NOTES.

No. I.

IT is said in our Petition that Bibles were not printed by Chepman and Millar. This remark is ridiculed by the respondents, because, at the time, the Bible had not been translated into English. But as the English language was not then the language of the *Church*, either of *England* or *Scotland*, or any other country; and as the most important of the books licensed by James IV. were in Latin, we do not see why he should not have included the Bible in the lists of books, if it had not appeared to the Council, that the supply might be obtained sufficiently by importation. The Bible in Latin, had been printed in many countries of Europe before this period. In Le Long's *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 129 editions are enumerated, before the dates of Chepman and Millar's gift, all of the Vulgate translation,—printed at *Mentz*, at *Rome*, at *Nuremberg*, at *Paris*, at *Venice*, at *Naples*, at *Basle*, at *Lyons*, at *Cologne*, at *Strasburg*, at *Antwerp*, at *Seville*, and other cities on the continent. Before this period also, at least *five* complete editions of the Hebrew Old Testament had been published, and more than *ten* editions of parts of the Hebrew Old Testament. Greek versions of the Psalms had likewise been published, and some parts of the New Testament.

There is no ground for conjecturing that any one of these books had been restrained in the most absolute governments. No privilege had been required for printing them; and it is inconceivable that the editions should have multiplied so rapidly, if the readers had not been numerous. No doubt these readers were generally churchmen.

No. II.

It has been said that there could be no occasion for many editions of the Bible, from the time when the people of Scotland first obtained leave to read it, as very few people in those days could read at all.

Reading, however, was not an uncommon accomplishment in that age. There were a good many schools in all the principal towns even before the Reformation, and they increased rapidly afterwards.

In fifty-six years (namely from 1558 to 1614) there were fourteen complete editions of the works of Sir David Lyndsay, including two printed at Paris, and three in England. But there

are many other editions of his separate pieces (See Lyndsay's Works, edited by George Chalmers, vol. i. p. 90.)

There were three editions of Buchanan's History, in 1582, 83, 84; and there were thirty-one editions of Buchanan's Psalms between 1566 and 1610, printed at Paris, London, and Antwerp, but not one in Scotland. The first edition of his history was printed at Edinburgh, by Arbuthnot, the printer of the Bible.

Of the works of Principal Rollock, who died in 1598, at least sixteen volumes were published before 1605; all of which passed rapidly through successive editions. His Commentary on St. John's Gospel, a book fully as large as a Latin Bible, containing more than 1200 pages, (pages containing nearly 300 words each) was printed at Edinburgh in 1599, and again at Geneva, in 1599, in 1600, and 1608. The Geneva editions are much more easily procured than the Edinburgh edition. Cowper, minister of Perth, published many books in London, after the accession of King James. One of them, "The Triumph of a Christian," passed through seven impressions before 1618, and through three more before 1630, besides being included in the collected edition of his works. In the same manner, the works of W. Guild, J. Abernethy, A. Symson, P. Symson, and others, passed through many editions between the year 1610 and 1633; during all which time we know of no complete edition of the Bible printed in Scotland, and of no edition of the New Testament, Psalms, or Catechisms, printed by any king's printer in Scotland.

It is more to the purpose to observe, that there were ninety editions of the English Bible printed in London from the year 1537 to 1611, the year after Andrew Hart's Bible was published, or in other words, the year when King James's version appeared, —and between seventy and eighty editions of the New Testament in the same period; besides many editions printed at Geneva, Rouen, and other places beyond seas.—See *Cotton's List of Bibles*, Lond. 1828; which, though extensive, omits several which the writer possesses.

Were the people of Scotland so far behind England as to require only two editions in the time when ninety editions were too few for England? The fact was far otherwise.

Was Scotland so far behind Ireland as to require a much more limited supply? It is said in Ware's Annals of Queen Elizabeth, that in 1566, a bookseller named Dale, imported from London 7000 copies of the Bible, the whole of which he sold in Ireland within two years.

If readers were not numerous, how is it that there were so many printers and so many booksellers in Edinburgh in the time of Queen Mary and James IV?

Between 1579 and 1599 we can produce books printed by Robert Lekprevik, Thomas Bassandyne, John Ross, Henry Charteris, Alexander Arbuthnot, Thomas Vautrollier, Robert Waldegrave. Soon afterwards we find printers at St. Andrews and Aberdeen,—and at St. Andrews in particular we know of at

least two printers, John Scot and Lekprevik, before the year 1579.

In the same period the Town Council Records of Edinburgh mention the following persons as booksellers; Robert Smith,* Henry Charteris, Andrew Hart, John Gibson, Edward Catkin, John Woodhouse, and John Simson, (all in 1592), besides John Norton, and others who dealt in importing books.

It has been mentioned in the "Memorial for the Bible Society," page 73, that, in the year 1616, a book, entitled *GOD AND THE KING*, was printed in London by his Majesty's command, *for the use of the kingdom of Scotland*. We mention it here merely as an instance of a book which must have been expected to find a vast number of readers. We do not know how many copies were circulated in Scotland; but we know that thousands were sent to Edinburgh for the use of the citizens. In 1620, (April 7.) it appears that "William Dick, auld thesaurare, delyverit to Peter Somervell, thesaurare" of the town,

* The following curious Extract from the Testament of Robert Smith, *librar* (i.e. bookseller) who died May 1, 1602, gives an idea of the demand for books used for the purposes of religion and education at that period.

"Item in his buyth the prentit buikis following all unbound, extending in the baill to aucht scoir rymmis of prentit paper, price of the rym *ls.*

Followis the names of the buikis.

- 2860 First Partis of Latyn Grammers
- 1820 Second Parts of Grammer.
- 840 Third and Fourth Paitris.
- 1253 Colloquia Corderii.
- 815 Colloquia Erasmi.
- 1275 Select Epissilis of Cicero.
- 2000 Prayeris before the Psalmes.
- 300 Callendairs to the Psalmes.
- 248 Doubill Catechismes.
- 1034 Dundie Psalmes.
- 1243 Fabilis of Isope.
- 1134 Winter Nites.
- 1648 Cressedis
- 232 Gray Steillis.
- 50 Psalme buikis.
- 45 Sevin Sagis.
- 736 Donettis.
- 377 Catois.
- 538 Second Rudiments.
- 155 Singill Catechismis.
- 680 Dicta Sapientum. .
- 933 Sulpicius.
- 433 Concordances.
- 223 Latyne Alphabettis.

Summa of the Inventar 680l."

In the Inventory of John Wreitton, Printer, who died Feb. 1640, we find 900 little Psalme buikis of David in Meitter in Octavo, estimat all to the soume of 180 lib

(That is, four shillings Scots, or fourpence Sterling for each.)

among other articles, “the buikis called God and the King, extending to the number of 1562 buikis, (copies) whereof the said Peter Somervell grantit the ressait.”* These appear to have been what remained of a cargo imported the preceding year to the amount of 2500 copies. We find in the Record of the Town Council of Edinburgh, 7th April, 1619, the following curious entry: “Ordanis William Dick, Thesaurare, for causes and considerations moveing thame, to pay Mr. James Prymrois ane thousand pound, and the sam soll be allowit to him in his compitis; and als ordanis the said Wm. Dick, Thesaurare to ressave from him twa thousand bookis, called God and the KING in Scotis, and fyve hundreth in Latine, and to disperse the same in the Colledges and Schools to the nichtbo^rs. of this brugh, for aught schillings the pece, and to be charget with the price thereof in his comptis.”

If the book had been distributed gratuitously, it would be impossible to say what was the ordinary demand of the reading population. But it was sold at a price equal to two days wages of a labourer,†—a very high price surely for a pamphlet of 89 pages small 8vo. or 40 pages small quarto, containing less letter-press than the Shorter Catechism with the proofs, or the Larger Catechism without the proofs. Yet, in one year, the Treasurer of the town of Edinburgh must have sold 938 copies, and it would be strange if the Booksellers had sold none at all. The book had been authorised and printed in 1616: and, therefore, the supply of the year 1619 may be supposed to have been very trifling when compared with the original distribution. The fact is, that the book was a catechism, which was required, first by the Privy Council of Scotland in June 1616, and subsequently by the General Assembly at Aberdeen, in August 1616, to be taught in all Universities, Colleges, Grammar and English Schools.‡ It was very far from being popular,—but though constraint was necessary to induce people to purchase it, the sale must have been rapid and extensive. In another point of

* Town Council Register, vol. xiii.

† It appears from the accounts of the Master of Works that the barrow-men and other labourers employed in the repairs of the Castle of Edinburgh in Feb. 1619, received twenty-four shillings Scots in the week, or four shillings a-day. It appears from the same accounts that a pair of hens might be bought for two shillings Scots; and it is known that a Scots pint of claret at that time cost 10 shillings Scots, or 5 shillings a bottle, *i. e.* 5d. sterling.

‡ Copies of the following documents relating to this book are in possession of the writer of this paper; (1.) James VI. Letter to the Privy Council of Scotland, April 14, 1616; (2.) Order of the Privy Council to four Bishops to report on the Book, May, 22, 1616; (3.) Report of the Bishops, June 6, 1616; (4.) Proclamation anent the said book, June 13, 1615; (5.) Licence to Mr James Prymrois, June 24, 1616; (6.) Ordinance of the General Assembly, Aberdeen, (Aug. 15, 1616) requiring the book to be taught in all schools; (7.) Canon (ratified by Charles I. May 23, 1633) requiring all Schoolmasters to train their scholars in the grounds contained in the book, entitled, *Deus et Rex*.

view, the history of this book deserves particular notice. It was authorized and appointed, both by the King and the Church of Scotland, to be used as a manual of religious instruction, and the privilege of printing it was given to the clerk of the Privy Council; and yet it was not printed by His Majesty's printer for Scotland, or by any one of the Scottish printers who had licences for printing Catechisms; but it was "printed in *London*, by his Majesties special privilege and command, to the only use of *Mr James Primrose*, for the kingdom of *Scotland*." If we were even to grant that King James's translation of the Bible had been authorized in Scotland, would it not have been as regular to send the whole supply necessary for Scotland from England, as in the case of this book, which, like the translation of the Bible, was prepared by divines of the English Church?

Concerning the books published in London between 1610 and 1633, it may not be amiss to remark, that the number was not diminished by the Proclamation, June 1615, anent printing of books *beyond sea*. According to the interpretation of His Majesty's Printers, who include England among the places beyond the seas, this proclamation would have prevented any of the works now referred to from being printed in London, unless they had been previously revised and approved by the Archbishops of St. Andrews and Glasgow. It is a well-known fact, that Gordon's History of Robert the Bruce, printed at Dort in 1615, has the imprimatur of the Archbishop of St. Andrews prefixed to it. But we never find his Grace's allowance or approbation expressed on the titles of any of the works of his countrymen printed in London about the same period. These works are very numerous; and it is curious that the persons who were understood to be best affected to the King, generally published their productions in London, although we know that some of them never resided in England.* The circumstance is worthy of notice, both as a proof that the phrase *beyond seas* was not considered applicable to England, and also a proof that though there were many printers in Scotland at the time when

* A few only are here mentioned.

Various Treatises by *Cowper*, Bishop of Galloway, from 1606 to 1629.

Abernethy, Bishop of Caithness, 3 editions of one quarto volume, entitled *Physicke for the Soul*, from 1615 to 1630.

Simson (Wil) de Accentibus Hebraicis. Lond. 1617,

Symson's (P.) History of the Church. Lond. 1624 and 1632.

Struthers' Christian Observations. Lond. 1628.

Lindesay, (Bishop of Brechin) a True Narration of the proceedings of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, holden at Perth, 25th Aug. 1618. Lond. 1621.

Pont, de Sabbaticorum Annorum periodis. Lond. 1619.

Pont, Chronologia de Sabbatis. Lond. 1626.

Symson (A.) on the Psalms. Lond. 1623.

Wishart's Exposition of the Lord's Prayer. Lond. 1633.

Adamson's Poemata Sacra. Lond. 1619.

J. Leochæi, Scotti, Musæ Piores. Lond. 1620.

we maintain that no editions of the Bible were printed in Scotland, yet the number of readers was so great, that the Scottish press was far from being sufficient to satisfy the demand for books.

No. III.

Observations on an Extract from Mr. Horne's Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures.—Lond. 1825. Vol. ii. p. 253.

“ Notwithstanding the great labour and attention bestowed by Dr Blayney, his edition must now yield the palm of accuracy to the very beautiful and correct edition published by Messrs Eyre and Strachan, his Majesty's printers, (but printed by Mr. Woodfall,) in 1806, and again in 1813 in quarto; as not fewer than one hundred and sixteen errors were discovered in collating the edition of 1806 with Dr. Blayney's, and one of these errors was an omission of considerable importance. Messrs Eyre and Strachan's editions may therefore be regarded as approaching as near as possible to what bibliographers term an *immaculate text.*” So says Mr. Horne; but he overrates the accuracy.

Mr Horne adds in a note that *one* erratum has been discovered in the edition of 1806. “ The booksellers of the metropolis (he says) having applied to his Majesty's printers to undertake a handsome edition of the Bible, confided the execution of it to Mr. George Woodfall in 1804. The copy printed from was the current Cambridge edition, with which Mr. Woodfall's edition agrees page for page. It was afterwards read twice by the Oxford impression then in use, and the proofs were then transmitted to the Rev. Launcelot Sharpe, by whom they were read with Dr. Blayney's 4to. edition of 1769. After the proofs returned by Mr Sharpe for press had been corrected, the forms were placed upon the press at which they were to be worked, and another proof was taken. This was read by Mr. Woodfall's superintendent, and afterwards by Mr. Woodfall himself, with Dr. Blayney's edition; and any errors that had previously escaped, were corrected. In the course of printing this edition from the Cambridge copy, a great number of very gross errors was discovered in the latter; and the errors of the common Oxford editions above noticed, were not so few as 1200! The London edition of 1806 being exhausted, a new impression was put to press in 1810, which was completed with equal beauty and accuracy in 1812, and published in 1813.”

Sempill, Sacrilege sacredly handled. Lond. 1619.

Guild, Moses Unveiled. Lond. 1620—1623, &c.

Yule, (Alex.) Ecphrasis Paraphr. G. Buchanan in *Psalmis.* Lond. 1620.

Spottiswood, Refutatio Libelli. Lond. 1620.

We have transcribed these passages from Mr. Horne's work, as they bear testimony to the accuracy of the edition of Messrs. Eyre and Strachan, which we are still desirous to have the privilege of importing—and which, even though they may not be so nearly immaculate as Mr. Horne seems to think, are certainly looked up to by the Scottish patentees as models worthy of imitation. We must own, however, that on points of this nature, and on some others of not less importance, we do not regard Mr. Horne as a safe guide. We need not look farther than this part of his book, to perceive that he speaks confidently of things which he cannot have examined personally, and that he has not, exercised any discrimination in the selection of his authorities.* At the bottom of page 251, he does not give the title of the first edition of King James's translation correctly. At the top of page 252, he says, that "there are copies which have the dates of 1612 and 1613," as if these were the same edition with different dates, instead of being different editions. In the 9th line of that page, he mentions Field's pearl Bible, printed at Cambridge in 1653 and says, that it is disgraced by numerous errata, some of which are of importance; and then in a note, he quotes from Mr. D'Israel two instances of errata, very disgraceful certainly; but they are not to be found in all the copies of Field's pearl Bible, to which he seems to ascribe 6000 errata. There are four well-known pocket editions of the Bible, all bearing the imprint of London, 1653, and two of them in the name of Field, but few copies of the pearl Bible contain these errors. Mr. Horne tells us that the very fine folio edition of 1701, published under the direction of Archbishop Tenison, *is said* to abound with typographical errors, and this report we will not gainsay. But we wonder very much that he should have known so little of the real history of the Oxford edition of 1769, revised by the late Dr. Blayney. He mentions in a note, that "in Dr. Blayney's quarto edition of 1769, the following words are *omitted* in Rev. xviii. 22, after the words "no more," viz. "at all in thee; and no

* So little does Mr. Horne know of the history of English translation, that he says p. 254, that the Psalms, and the Epistles and Gospels, in the Book of Common Prayer, were continued, "the former according to the translation of Cranmer's Bible, and the latter according to that of the Bishops' Bible, until the final revision of the Liturgy in 1661." If he had only opened any edition of the Book of Common Prayer older than 1661, and compared it with Cranmer's and the Bishops' Bible, he would have seen that not only the Psalms, but the Gospels and Epistles, are uniformly of the translation called Cranmer's. And if he had read the "Exceptions of the Presbyterian brethren against some passages in the present Liturgy," in 1661, he would have perceived that the mistranslations of which they complained are all found in Cranmer's Bible, and none in the Bishops' except where the Bishops' Bible has followed Cranmer. For instance, the expression, John ii. 10, *when men be drunk*; Phil. ii. 7, *found in his apparel as a man*; Luke xi. 17, *one house doth fall upon another*, are all in Cranmer's Bible, but in the Bishops' they are read thus,—"when the guests have well drunke"—"found in figure as a man"—"a house divided against a house falleth."

craftsman of whatsoever craft *he be*, shall be found any more." "It is proper to add," (he says) "that this omission was caused in over-running the folio edition of 1760 into the quarto size." Before Mr. Horne offered this ingenious apology, he might have been expected to ascertain that the folio edition is correct,—and perhaps he may be surprised to learn that the folio edition of 1769 actually contains the mistake which he ascribes only to the quarto, and that it was transferred to several subsequent impressions. Mr. Horne then refers to three mistakes which have occurred in the Oxford Bibles in the course of the last 110 years—1st, the error in the running title of Luke xx. where we read "the parable of the *vinegar*," instead of "the parable of the *vineyard*," in Baskett's splendid folio of 1716. (Baskett, it must be recollected, was at that time the only printer of Bibles in England, and during his monopoly, the incorrectness of his editions was formally complained of to the King: but the mistake after all is not in the text.) 2dly, The 8vo. Oxford Bible of 1792 is remarkable for a mistake in Luke xxii. 54, where *Philip* instead of *Peter* is named as the disciple who should deny Christ; and, 3dly, The 8vo. Bible printed at Oxford in 1811, is said to have this mistake in Isaiah lvii. 12, "I will declare thy righteousness, and thy works; for they shall profit thee." These three cases were mentioned from the Bench,—as well as the 116 errors in Dr. Blayney, and 1200 in the Common Oxford Bibles, and numberless errors in the Cambridge copy,—and then it was added, "and those are the Bibles the friends of the poor would wish to introduce into Scotland. I venture to say there are fewer errors in Scottish Bibles at this moment, than in any prior to that edition of Eyre and Strachan."

We do not say that these are venial errors; but we do say that we never imported the *Vinegar* Bible, or the Bible with *Philip's* name instead of *Peter*, (both of which editions were printed when the King's printer in England did not compete with the Universities,) nor did we ever import any Bible in which the particle *not* is omitted in Isaiah lvii. 12. But we can point out many errors in Scottish Bibles equal to the worst of those which are here charged on the Bibles of Oxford. Is it any better to substitute *James* instead of *Jesus* in Acts i. 14, than *Philip* instead of *Peter* in Luke xxii. 34? See the Edinburgh Pocket Bible of 1816. The error is not found in all the copies of the edition 1816, as the sheet (or part of it) was cancelled after the book had been some time in circulation. But let us take a few more specimens of Scottish accuracy. All Bibles printed in England, so far as we have seen, read Heb. ii. 16, "He took **NOT** on him the nature of angels." The Edinburgh quarto of 1760 reads, "He took on him the nature of angels." Bibles printed in England read Rom. vi. 17, thus, "Ye were the servants of sin." The Edinburgh Pocket Bible 1698, reads, "Ye were **NOT** the servants of sin." Bibles printed in England, read Psalm liii. 1.—"The fool hath said in his heart, there is no

God." The Edinburgh folio of 1722 reads, "The fool hath said in his heart there is on God;" and at that period it is well known that *one* was very commonly written and pronounced *on* in Scotland. Bibles printed in England always read Psalm cxix. 35,—"Make me to go in the way of thy commandments." The Edinburgh quarto of 1791 reads, "Make me **NOT** to go in the way of thy commandments." Psalm liii. 1, is usually read, "NOT one of them doth good," but Sir D. H. Blair and Mr. Bruce's Psalms in 1811 and 1814, have this unintelligible variation, "THAT one of them doth good." Bibles printed in England have this reading, Luke vi. 29, "Him that taketh away thy cloak, forbid **NOT** to take thy coat also." In 1816, Sir D. H. Blair and Mr. Bruce printed a New Testament, in which this maxim is reversed, thus, "Forbid to *take* thy coat also. Another edition by Sir D. H. Blair and Mr. Bruce printed in 1824, has the reading altered so far as to omit the repetition of the particle *to*,—thus, forbid *to take*, &c. We could mention other cases in which the Scottish and English editions are diametrically opposite, and cases too in which the contradictions in proclamations under the King's authority must have been somewhat perplexing. Thus, King James set forth a proclamation in 1685, which, according to the English edition, prohibited the use of any *unlawful* sports and exercises on the Lord's day, and other festivals; but when his Majesty's printer for Scotland reprinted the proclamation, the prohibition was directed against the use of any *lawful* sports and exercises.

No IV.

Confession of Faith.

There is little doubt that the earliest Scottish edition of the Confession of Faith, now in use, was printed, not by the King's printer, but by Gideon Lithgow, printer to the City and College of Edinburgh, in 1650.

It has been asked by the Bench, where is a genuine edition of the Confession of Faith, to be had, if not from the King's printer?

To this we answer;

1st, We ought to look rather to the Church than to the State for the true and exact standards of religious doctrine—and the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland does every year instruct the Commission to take care that the impressions of the *Scriptures*, the *Confession of Faith*, and the *Catechisms*, and such other books as are authorised by this Church, relating to the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government thereof, be correct; and give directions about printing the same.

2d, The *Confession of Faith* is not only the standard of Christian doctrine, and its authority must be resolved into that of the

Scripture. The supreme and only infallible rule of faith, according to our confession, is the Scripture itself,—but not any particular version, though allowed both by civil and ecclesiastical authority. The confession (ch. 1.) directs us to the original Hebrew and Greek text as being authentical, and in all controversies, the church is finally to appeal to these inspired originals. Now, we ask in return—Where are we to find copies of this primary standard? If the state has never provided the books of paramount authority, can it be any satisfaction that it gives orders for the printing of the subordinate standards, of which, however, it takes no farther charge than the appointment of an officer, to whom it professes to give the power of printing them, without furnishing an edition which he is bound to copy.

The fact is, that the edition of the Confession of Faith, as well as of the Bible, which his Majesty's printers are to follow, is left altogether to their own discretion. The editions by Lumisden, Uriel, Foulis, &c. are better than those of any king's printers.

So slovenly is the manner in which the Confession of Faith has been printed by his Majesty's printers, that we have never yet seen an edition printed by any of them, which contains correctly the authority under which the book has been established. Watson's edition in 1719 has omitted the act of the General Assembly, Aug. 27, 1647, approving and establishing the Confession of Faith, and has inserted only an Extract of the act of Parliament 1690, ratifying the Confession of Faith, and settling Presbyterian Church government. All the other editions printed by any of the patentees in Scotland, so far as we have seen, and most certainly all the editions of the present patentees, have omitted the act of parliament 1690 altogether, except in so far as they mention it in the title page of the Confession, along with the act of parliament 1649, as if it possessed the same authority. They have, however, contrived to print at length this last mentioned act of the Scottish Parliament—(February 7, 1649)—as if they did not know that it was a rescinded act,—and no doubt the reason why they prefer this to the act 1690 really in force, must be, that the act 1649 ratifies not only the Confession of Faith, but the Catechisms, Larger and Shorter, which were not ratified by the act 1690.

They have thought fit to print, with the Confession of Faith, several other rescinded acts, viz. the act, June 11, 1640, ratifying the National Covenant,—the act July 15, 1644, ratifying the League and Covenant,—the act, October 14, 1648, for renewing the Solemn League and Covenant, and the act, February 6, 1645, approving and establishing the Directory for public worship.

They print always, as a book of public authority in the Church of Scotland, *The Sum of Saving Knowledge*, though it never obtained any authority either from the Church or from the State.

And it is very singular that they should still print the Confession of Faith, the Directory of Public Worship, and the Form

of Presbyterian Church Government, “*as a part of the Covenanted Uniformity in Religion betwixt the Churches of Christ in the Kingdoms of SCOTLAND, ENGLAND, and IRELAND.*” These words are inserted on the title pages of every one of these three subdivisions of the book which is commonly known by the general title of *The Confession of Faith*.

That the editions of the Confession of Faith printed by unprivileged printers have been recognized by the church, might be made to appear from a variety of indisputable facts. Thus in 1726 (March 10,) the Report of the Commission upon the printed Instructions of the General Assembly contains the following paragraph :

“ As to the putting a stop to the printing, vending, and importing incorrect copies of the Holy Scriptures, and of our *Confession of Faith* and *Catechisms*, there has been no occasion for doing any thing this year, (i. e. from May 1725 to March 1726,) no such incorrect copies having been attempted to be published that the Commission knows of.”

In the course of this year an edition of the *Confession of Faith* and *Catechisms* in Gaelic had been published by *Thomas Lumisden* and *John Robertson*, and the whole impression was purchased by the General Assembly.—In the same year *T. Lumisden* and *J. Robertson* printed in English “ *The Confessions of Faith, Catechisms, Directories, Form of Church Government, Discipline, &c.* of public authority of the Church of Scotland.” If this had been considered an incorrect edition, the Commission could scarcely have failed to take notice of it, or if it had been irregular in these printers to publish the work, it is not likely that they should have escaped censure.

In the Preface to Lumisden’s Edition of the *Confession, Catechisms, &c.* it is said of Watson’s edition in two volumes, that “ many, both in a public and private capacity, have justly complained, that some things of no small moment belonging to such a Collection, and in use to be printed and bound with former editions of our *Westminster Confession*, are left out; and that others which have no pretence thereto are inserted; that the first volume is unnecessarily swelled by a long preface of the Publishers; and that the third volume, when published, is also to be augmented by a vindication of that Preface; so that we are like to have three volumes, bearing PUBLIC AUTHORITY in their titles; and yet about a third part of them will be in effect the work of private hands, while in the mean time important parts of the Church of Scotland’s Testimony are wholly omitted; particularly the *Solemn League and Covenant*, that great eyesore to all the enemies of Reformation.”

His Majesty’s Printers now print the *Solemn League and Covenant*, not caring whether it possesses authority or not,—and in this as in many other respects, they depart from Watson’s edition, which, in the course of the pleadings, was said by one of their Counsel (not very correctly) to have received the approbation of the Church of Scotland. See Appendix, No. 79.

No. V.

Power of the King and other Magistrates in matters of Religion, according to the Ecclesiastical Law of Scotland.

Not one of the standards of the Church of Scotland affords any countenance to the claim of the exclusive right of the supreme magistrate to publish the Scriptures.

The *Scots Confession of Faith* ratified in Parliament in 1567, contains the following expression in chap. xxiv. "Of the Civile Magistrate:—"

"We confess and acknowledge *Empyres, Kingdoms, Dominionis, and Cities*, to be distinkted and ordained be God; the powers, and autoritie in the same, be it of *Emperouris* in their *Empyres*, of *Kingis* in their *realmes*, *Dukes and Princes* in their *dominionis*, and of utheris *Magistrates* in the Cities, to be God's holy ordinance ordained for manifestation of his own glory, and for the singular profit and comoditie of mankind

"Mairover to *Kings, Princes, Rulers, and Magistrates*, we affirme that chieflie and most principallie the conservation and purgation of the religion apperteins; so that not onlie they are appointed for civil policie, bot also for maintenance of the trew religion, and for suppressing of idolatrie and superstition whatsoever; as in David, Josaphat, Ezechias, Josias, and utheris highly commended for their zeale in that cause may be espyed," &c.

In a previous part of this Confession, it is said that "the interpretation of Scripture neither appertains to private nor publick person, neither yet to ony kirk, for ony preheminence or prerogative, personallie or locallie, quhilk ane has above ane uther, but appertains to the Spirit of God, be the quhilk also the Scripture was written." (Chap. 18.)

It is evident from this and other passages that it was not admitted by the Church of Scotland, that the king has any right to decide either how much is comprehended in the word of God, or how it ought to be translated, interpreted, or promulgated.

The power of the Magistrates, in matters of religion, was sufficiently defined, in other acts of that Parliament. By act 3, the Contraveners of the Confession of Faith, and of the act against Idolatry, were to be punished according to the laws. By act 5, hearers and sayers of Mass were to be punished for the first fault at the discretion of the Magistrate within whose jurisdiction they were apprehended; for the second, by banishment from the realm; and for the third, by *justifying to the death*.

Then follows the act concerning the Coronation oath, which, it must be observed, like the 24th chapter of the Confession, ascribes to other Magistrates as well as to the King, the *power* and

duty of maintaining true religion, and abolishing that which is false. The meaning cannot be sufficiently understood without reading the whole.

In the Report of the Speeches of the Judges, this Act is adverted to (as well as Act 4, ratifying the Confession,) but it does not appear to have occurred to any of their Lordships, that the manner in which the Magistrates, whether supreme or subordinate, are to maintain the true, and abolish and gainstand the false religion, is expressly required to be regulated, first of all by the revealed word of God; secondly, by the laws and constitution of the realm, not repugnant to the word of God; and lastly, by the determinations of the Church Courts. This passage, in particular, at the end of the oath, deserves consideration. “They shall be careful to root out all hereticks and enemies to the true worship of God, *that shall be convict by the true kirk of God* of the foresaid crimes.”* The king and other Magistrates were not declared to be the judges of heresy, or of true or false worship; but the Church was to decide, and the Magistrates were to punish those who were convicted of being enemies of the truth.

We may remark, that the Parliament, 1567, passed an Act “anent the jurisdiction of the kirk,” which is not printed in the common editions; and which (as now printed in Mr. Thomson’s collection) contains the following clause, “That thair be na uther jurisdiction Ecclesiastical within this realme, uther than that quhilk is and sal be within the same kirk.”

The Westminster Confession is referred to on the same subject. But several material passages of the Confession have escaped the notice which they deserve. Thus, chap. 30, it is said that “the Lord Jesus Christ, *as King and head of his church*, hath herein appointed a government in the hand of church-officers, distinct from the Civil Magistrate.” Chap. 31, It is said, that “it belongeth to Synods and Councils ministerially to determine controversies of faith, to set down rules and directions for the better ordering of the public worship of God and government of the Church, to receive complaints in cases of mal-administration, and *authoritatively to determine the same*. Which degrees and determinations, if consonant to the word of God, are to be received with reverence and submission, not only for their agreement with the word, *but also for the power whereby they are made*, *as being an ordinance of God appointed thereunto in his word*.” Here, surely, a power is recognised which is not dependant on that of the state: And this is not only Church law, but the law

* The oath taken by William and Mary in 1689 contained this clause, “We shall be careful to root out all hereticks and enemies to the true worship of God, *that shall be convict by the true kirk of God* of the forsaid crimes, out of our lands and empire of Scotland.” The oath taken since the Union binds the Sovereign to maintain the rights and privileges of the Church of Scotland as established by the laws made there, in prosecution of the claim of right.

of the land promulgated in the act 1690, ratifying the Confession of Faith. In chap. 20, "Of Christian Liberty and Liberty of Conscience," it is said that "they who, upon pretence of Christian liberty shall oppose any lawful power, or the lawful exercise of it, whether it be civil or ecclesiastical, resist the ordinance of God. And for the publishing of such opinions, or maintaining of such practices, as are contrary to the light of nature, or to the known principles of Christianity, whether concerning faith, worship, or conversation; or to the power of godliness, or such erroneous opinions or practices, as either in their own nature, or in the manner of publishing and maintaining them, are destructive to the external peace and order which Christ had established in the church, they may lawfully be called to account, and proceeded against *by the censures of the church and by the power of the civil magistrate.*

It is scarcely to be disputed that the understanding both of church and state, concerning this matter, was, that in all cases the inquiry and censure of the church was to precede the interference of the civil magistrate, unless it should appear to the civil magistrate that the church neglected its duty, in which case he was not to proceed on his own proper authority, but to call an ecclesiastical assembly, either general or provincial, or even of more limited jurisdiction, and though he might be present, so as to provide that what was transacted was agreeable to the mind of God, it was never said to be his prerogative, but the right of the church *authoritatively to determine cases of complaints against error.*

The views of the Church of Scotland on this matter may be learned from the Act of the General Assembly, September 1, 1647, approving eight general heads of doctrine against the tenets of Erastianism, Independency, and Liberty of Conscience. The peculiar power in religious matters assigned to the civil magistrate in this act, is thus expressed:—"The civil magistrate may and ought to suppress by corporal or civil punishments, such as, by spreading error or heresy, or by fomenting schism, greatly dishonour God, dangerously hurt religion, and disturb the peace of the kirk." The exi Propositions more fully explain the power of the Magistrate. Thus, Prop. 3.—"The church ought to be governed by no other persons than Ministers and Stewards preferred and placed by Christ and after no other manner than according to the laws made by him; and, therefore, there is no power on earth which may challenge to itself authority or dominion over the Church." Prop. 41.—"Every lawful Magistrate may and ought first and chiefly to take charge of God's glory, and (according to his place or in his manner and way,) to preserve religion when pure, and to restore it when decayed and corrupted; and also to provide a learned and godly Ministry, Schools also, and Synods, as likewise to restrain and punish atheists, blasphemers, heretics, and schismatics, as the violators of justice and civil peace."—Prop.

43,—“ Yet the Civil Power and the Ecclesiastical ought not by any means to be confounded or mixed together.” Prop. 46.—“ It is in the power of the Magistrates to afford places fit for holy Assemblies, and other external helps by which the sacred matters of the Lord may more safely, commodiously, and easily in the Church be performed, to remove the external impediments of divine worship, or of Ecclesiastical peace, and to repress those which exalt themselves against the true Church and her Ministers, and do raise up trouble against them.” Prop. 50.—“ Unto the external things of the Church belongeth not only the correction of heretics and other troublers of the Church, but also that civil order and way of convocating and calling together Synods which is proper to the Magistrate, for the Magistrate ought by his authority and power both to establish the rights and liberties of Synods assembling together, at times appointed by the known and received law, and to indict and gather together Synods occasionally, as often as the necessity of the Church shall require the same; not that all or any power to consult or determine of ecclesiastic or spiritual matters doth flow or spring from the Magistrate as head of the Church under Christ; but because in those things pertaining to the outward man, the Church “ needeth the Magistrate’s aid and support.” Prop. 51.—“ So that the Magistrate calleth together Synods, not as touching those things which are proper to Synods, but in respect of the things which are common to Synods, with other meetings and civil public assemblies, that is, not as they are assemblies in the name of Christ, to treat of matters spiritual, but as they are public assemblies within his territories; for to the end that public conventions may be kept in any territory, the licence of the Lord of that place ought to be desired. In Synods, therefore, a respect of order as well Civil as Ecclesiastical is to be had; and because of this civil order, outward defence, better accommodation, together with safe access and recess, the consent and commandment of him who is appointed to take care of and defend human order doth intervene.” Prop. 64,—“ All the actions of the Civil Magistrate, even when he is employed about Ecclesiastical matters, are of their own nature, and essentially civil; he punisheth externally idolaters, blasphemers, sacrilegious persons, heretics, profaners of holy things, and according to the nature and measure of the sin, he condemneth to death or banishment, forfeiture of goods or imprisonment; he *guardeth and underpropeth Ecclesiastical Canons* with civil authority, giveth a place of habitation to the Church in his territory, restraineth or expelleth the insolent and untamed disturbers of the Church.” Prop. 65,—“ He taketh care also for maintaining the Ministers and Schools, and supplieth the temporal necessities of God’s servants; by his command assemblmeth Synods when there is need of them; and summoneth, calleth out, and draws to trial the unwilling; which, without the Magistrates’ strength and authority cannot be done, as hath been

already said ; he maketh Synods also safe and secure, and *in a civil way* presideth or moderateth in them, (if it so seem good to him,) either by himself, or by a substitute Commissioner ; in all which the power of the Magistrate, though occupied about spiritual things, is not for all that spiritual but civil."

In short, it is undeniable that the standards of the Church of Scotland nowhere assign to the Civil Magistrate a power either to establish a system of doctrines—or to prescribe modes of worship—or to preach the gospel—or to administer the Sacraments—or to exercise Ecclesiastical discipline, either personally or by deputies—or to licence and ordain ministers, and other Church officers—or to suspend or depose Ministers and other Church officers—or to judge and authoritatively determine in controversies of faith—or impose rules for the ministration of the Word and Sacraments—or to frame Ecclesiastical Canons—or to remit or reverse the sentences passed by the judicatories of the Church. Under our present constitution, there can be no appeal to the King from the determinations of the Church in any spiritual matter.

The power in religious matters ascribed to the King and other Civil Rulers by divines of this Church, is of three sorts. 1. A defensive power. It is understood to be the duty of the Civil Magistrate to protect the Church in the observance of the ordinances,—to provide and maintain places of worship,—to remove all obstacles to the performance of divine service,—to secure the support of Ministers and Teachers, and assist and maintain the discipline of the kirk, punishing civilly those who will not obey its censures. 2. A ruling power, not only in the calling of Assemblies, but in requiring them to proceed to the enactment of necessary regulations, and in confirming their proceedings so as to give them the weight of civil authority. 3. A coactive power, which may be exercised over the persons and property of Ecclesiastical persons, in all matters Civil or Criminal,—or in restraining Church Courts from overstepping the bounds of their peculiar jurisdiction,—or in punishing by Civil means those Ministers and other Church officers who are found by the Church Courts to have violated the rules to which they are subject,—or, lastly, in suppressing heresies and blasphemies, and inflicting penalties on the offenders who have been convicted by the Church. In this respect it is, more than any other, that the Church of Scotland has declared that " it is the duty of the Civil Magistrate to see that the truth of God be kept pure and entire." See Appendix No. XLI.

No. XXXVII.

*Commissio Georgii Ridpathi Josephi Watson et Andreæ Bell de
officio Bibliopolæ Bibliopegi et Stationarii Regis.*

GEORGIUS Dei gratia Magnæ Britannie Franciæ et Hiberniæ Rex fideiique Defensor Omnibus probis hominibus ad quos præsentes Literæ nostræ pervenerint Salutem Quandoquidem nos considerantes Quod per nuperam nostram Donationem forma Anglicana et ibidem locum habentem in favorem Edwardi Castle de London Stationarii illi ejusque heredibus executoribus administratoribus et assignatis dedimus officium et munus seu officia et munera Bibliopolæ Bibliopegi et Stationarii nobis heredibus et successoribus nostris ad suppeditandum nobis heredibus et successoribus nostris et officinis nostris publicis inibi mentionatis Libros Mercimonia Stationaria Librorum compactiones omniaque alia ad diversas artes Bibliopolæ Bibliopegi et Stationarii pertinenta et spectantia pro et durante termino quadraginta annorum adie et data dictæ donationis Nosque etiam perpendentes publico nostro ministerio utile fore ut idem officium personæ seu personis idoneis ad suppeditandum nobis nostris que regio heredibus et successoribus ac officinis nostris publicis in Scotia postea mentionatis omnia ad diversas artes Bibliopolæ Bibliopegi et Stationarii pertinen. et spectan. concederetur Nosque etiam regio nostro animo perpendentes constantem zelum et affectum erga Religionem reformatam præsentemque constitutionem felicis successionis nostræ ac nostrorum heredum a qua proxime et secundum Deum conservatio veræ Religionis libertatum jurium et felicitatis subditorum nostrorum dependet Quorum Georgius Ridpath de London Generosus Josephus Watson de Berwick Mercator Andreas Bell de London Stationarius et Magister Joannes Derby sacer dicti Andreæ Bell insignia suo quisque loco respective indicia dederunt idque pessimis temporibus damnis et periculis expositi Igitur Nos ex speciali nostra

gratia certa scientia et proprio motu nominavimus constituimus et ordinavimus sicuti tenore præsentium nominamus constituimus et ordinamus dict. Georgium Ridpath Josephum Watson et Andream Bell conjunctim eorumque heredes substitutos et assignatos ad officium et munus vel officia et munera Bibliopolæ Bibliopegi et Stationarii in Scotia pro nobis regiis nostris heredibus et successoribus ad suppeditandum nobis heredibus nostris regiis et successoribus officinis vectigalium excisæ rei tabeliarie et politiæ in Scotia Libros Mercimonia et Stationaria Librorum compactiones omniaque alia ad diversas artes Bibliopolæ Bibliopegi et Stationarii pertinen. et spectan. tam plene et ample quam dictus Edwardus Castle Bibliopola et Stationarius in Anglia tenet aut fruitur vel de lege tenere vel frui potest vel debet idque pro spatio quadraginta unius annorum complet. a die dætae præsentis Cum plena potestate dict. Georgio Ridpath Josepho Watson et Andreæ Bell conjunctim eorumque predict. utendi exercendi et fruendi dicto munere et officio durante tempore antedicto Cum omnibus proficuis emolumentis immunitatibus et privilegiis eis spectan. aut ad dict. officium de jure spectare aut concedi valentibus Et nos per præsentes pro nobis heredibus et successoribus nostris stricte prohibemus et vetamus omnes et singulas personam seu personas se dict. officio et munere seu officiis et muneribus duran. termino antedict. in contrarium regiæ nostræ voluntatis et veræ præsentium intentionis immiscere Una etiam (pro spatio et termino antedict.) cum ea annua pensione quæ antea constituta fuit vel tanquam feodum et salariū pro dict. officio constituimus. In cuius rei testimonium præsentibus sigillum nostrum per Unionis Tractatum custodiend. et in Scotia vice et loco Magni Sigilli ejusdem utend. ordinatum appendi mandavimus Apud Aulam nostram de St. James's quinto Februarii Anno Domini millesimo septingentesimo decimo octavo Regnique nostri quarto.

Per signaturam manu S. D. N. Regis suprascript.

No. XXXVIII.

Commissio Jacobi Hunter Blair armigeri et Joannis Bruce armigeri, de officiis et locis Bibliopolæ Bibliopegi et Stationarii S. D. N. Regis Scotiæ, 1785.

GEORGIVS Dei Gratia Magnæ Britanniæ Franciæ et Hiberniæ Rex fidei Defensor Omnibus probis hominibus ad quos præsentes Literæ nostræ pervenerint salutem. Quandoquidem nos intelligentes quod Regius noster Avus Georgius Rex illius nominis Secundus beatæ memoriæ per Literas patentes sub sigillo per Unionis Tractatum custodiend. et in Scotia vice et loco Magni Sigilli ejusdem utend. ordinat. de data vigesimo primo die mensis Junii millesimo septingentesimo quadragesimo nono concessebat Alexandro Kincade ejusq. hæredibus substitutis et assignatis officium et locum seu officia et loca Bibliopolæ Bibliopegi et Stationarii intra Scotiam dict. suo Majestati hæredibus ejus regiis et successoribus ad suppeditandum illi, hæredibus suis et successoribus ac etiam officinis Vectigalium Excisæ Rei Tabellariæ et Politiæ in Scotia libros, mercimonia, stationaria, librorum compactiones omniaq. alia ad diversas artes Bibliopolæ Bibliopegi et Stationarii pertinen. et spectan. pro et durante spa-
tio quadraginta unius annorum initio inde sumpto et loco habito ab et post diem in quem literæ patentes concessæ per Georgium Regem primum in diem quintum Februarii millesimo septingentesimo decimo septimo ad Georgium Redpath, Josephum Watson, et Andream Bell hæredes assignatos seu substitutos eorum expirarent Nosque certiores facti de facultatibus et qualificationibus Jacobi Hunter Blair armigeri et Joannis Bruce armigeri ad exercendum et exequendum singula et respectiva negotia spectantia ad dictum officium et locum vel officia et loca Igitur nos ex speciali nostra gratia certa scientia et proprio motu nominavimus constituimus et ordinavimus tenoreq. præsentium nominamus constituimus et ordinamus memoratum Jacobum Hunter Blair et Joannem Bruce hæredes substitutos et

assignatos eorum Bibliopolas Bibliopegos et Stationarios intus Scotiam nobis hæredibus nostris Regiis et successoribus ad supeditandum nobis hæredibus nostris Regiis et successoribus ac etiam officinis Vectigalium Excisæ et Rei Tabellariae in Scotia libros mercimonia stationaria librorum compactiones omniaq. alia ad diversas artes Bibliopolæ Bibliopegi et Stationarii pertinent. et spectan. pro et durante spatio quadraginta unius annorum initio inde sumpto et effectum sortiente ab et post diem super quem præfatum diploma memorato Alexandro Kincade ejusq. hæredibus assignatis vel substitutis concessum expirabit cum plena potestate illis dict. Jacobo Hunter Blair et Joanni Bruce eorumque antedictis dicto loco et officio durante spatio prædicto utendi exercendi et gaudendi adeo plenarie et ample quam dict. Alexander Kincade hæredes ejus assignati vel substituti tenent et fruuntur vel de lege tenere vel eodem frui possunt vel debent cum omnibus perquisitis emolumentis immunitatis et privilegiis ad idem spectantibus vel ad dict. officium de jure spectare aut concedi valentibus una etiam (pro spatio et termino antedicto) cum ea annua pensione quæ antea constituta fuit vel tanquam feodum et Salarium pro dicto officio constituimus Et nos per præsentes stricte prohibemus et vetamus omnes et singulas alias personam seu personas quascunque in dicto officio et loco seu officiis et locis durante spatio prædicto immiscere In cuius rei testimonium præsentibus sigillum nostrum per Unionis Tractatum custodiend. et in Scotia vice et loco Magni Sigilli ejusd. utend. ordinat. appendi mandavimus. Apud Aulam nostram apud St. James secundo die mensis Novembris millesimo septingentesimo octogesimo quinto Regnique nostri anno vigesimo sexto.

Per signaturam manu S. D. Regis suprascript.

No. XXXIX.

Grant to BOULTER GRIERSON of Printer-General for Ireland.

Upon Search, it appeareth that the Inrolment of a Grant remains of Record amongst the Rolls in the Rolls Office of his Majesty's High Court of Chancery in Ireland, of which the following is a Copy:—

GEORGE the Third, by the Grace of God, of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, King, Defender of the Faith, and so forth, —to all unto whom these presents shall come, greeting.— WHEREAS our royal predecessors, King William and Queen Mary of glorious memory, did, by their letters patent, under the great seal of our Kingdom of Ireland, bearing date the twenty-sixth day of June, in the fifth year of their reign, give and grant unto Andrew Crook, the office of Printer-General within our said Kingdom of Ireland, to have and hold the said office unto him, the said Andrew Crook, for and during the term of his natural life: And Whereas our late Royal Grandfather, of gloriuous and happy memory, did, by his letters patent, under the great seal of our said Kingdom of Ireland, bearing date the first day of December, in the first year of his reign, grant unto George Grierson, of the City of Dublin, printer, the said office of Printer-General, within our said Kingdom of Ireland, for and during the term of his natural life, from and immediately after the death, surrender, forfeiture, or other sooner determination of the letters patent, granted as aforesaid to the said Andrew Crook: And Whereas, upon a surrender made of the letters patent, so granted to the said George Grierson, our said late Royal Grandfather did, by other letters patent under the great seal of our said kingdom of Ireland, bearing date the eighteenth day of June, in the fourth year of his reign, grant unto him, his executors, administrators, and assigns, the said Office of Printer-General, within our said kingdom of Ireland, for and during the

term of forty years, to commence from and immediately after the death, surrender, forfeiture, or other determination of the said letters patent, granted by our royal predecessors, King William and Queen Mary, to the said Andrew Crook: And Whereas the said George Grierson is since deceased, and Boulter Grierson, his only surviving son, the present patentee, hath humbly besought us, on the surrender of the said last mentioned letters patent, to grant unto him letters patent of the said Office of Printer-General of our said kingdom of Ireland, for the term of forty years; and we being graciously pleased to condescend to his request, know ye, therefore, that we, of our special grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, by and with the advice and consent of our right trusty and right well beloved cousin and counsellor Francis Seymour, Earl of Hertford, our Lieutenant-General, and Governor-General of our said kingdom of Ireland, and according to the tenor and effect of our letters under our privy signet, and sign manual, bearing date at our Court at St. James's, the tenth day of January, one thousand seven hundred and sixty-six, in the sixth year of our reign, and now enrolled in the rolls of our High Court of Chancery in our said kingdom of Ireland, Have given and granted, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, we do give and grant unto the said Boulter Grierson, his executors, administrators, and assigns, the said Office of our Printer-General, within our said kingdom of Ireland, upon his, the said Boulter Grierson's, surrendering the said letters patent, granted by our said late royal grandfather, to him the said George Grierson, as aforesaid; And we do hereby give and grant unto the said Boulter Grierson, his executors, administrators, and assigns, full power and authority for the sole imprinting, in our said kingdom of Ireland, Bibles in all sizes or volumes, books of Common Prayer, and singing psalms in all sizes or volumes, Psalters, books of the New Testament in all sizes or volumes, Primers having the Catechism therein, the statutes for the kingdom of Ireland, both entire and abridged, with all such other printing as shall be published by authority of us, our heirs, or successors, and him the said Boulter Grierson, our sole Printer-General within our said kingdom of Ireland, we do, by these presents, constitute, make,

ordain, and appoint to have and to hold the said office, with all profits, commodities, advantages, pre-eminencies, and privileges thereunto belonging, or in any wise appertaining unto the said Boulter Grierson, his executors, administrators, and assigns, for and during the term, time, and space of forty years, to commence from the day upon which the surrender of the said letters patent, granted by our said late royal grandfather, to the said George Grierson, of the said office, shall be duly made and executed, to be executed and exercised by the said Boulter Grierson, or his sufficient deputy or deputies, or the sufficient deputy or deputies of his executors, administrators, or assigns, for and during the said term of forty years; And we do hereby will, and expressly forbid and prohibit, all and every our subjects of what nature or place soever, and all others whatsoever, besides the said Boulter Grierson, his deputy or assigns, from and after the date of these our letters patent, during the said term of forty years, that they or any of them by themselves, or by any others whatsoever, do imprint, or cause to be imprinted, within our said realm of Ireland, any of the said Bibles, Books of Common Prayer, and Singing Psalms, Psalters, Books of the New Testament, Primers, statutes, proclamations, or any other printing which shall be published by authority of us our heirs or successors, without the licence of the said Boulter Grierson, his executors, administrators, or assigns, his or their deputy or deputies first had and obtained. And further of our special grace, certain knowledge and mere motion, by and with the advice and consent aforesaid, we have given and granted, and by these presents for us, our heirs and successors, we do give and grant unto the said Boulter Grierson, his executors, administrators, and assigns, and his and their deputy or deputies, during the said term of forty years, full licence and authority from time to time, from and immediately after the surrender of the said letters patent, granted by our said late royal grandfather to the said George Grierson of the said Office, that he and they may, within our said realm of Ireland, as often as occasion shall require, take up such and so many skilful workmen in the said trade, art, or mystery of printing, as they or either of them, in their discretion, shall think fit to work in the said trade, art, or mystery, for such

reasonable wages as he the said Boulter Grierson, his executors, administrators, or assigns, shall appoint, and for so long time as they shall want the said workmen. And further of our more abundant grace, certain knowledge and mere motion, by and with the advice and consent aforesaid, we have given and granted, and by these presents for us, our heirs and successors, we do give and grant unto the said Boulter Grierson, his executors, administrators, or assigns, an annuity, fee, and pension of eight pounds of current and lawful money of England by the year, for the exercise and execution of the said Office ; To have, perceive, and receive the said fee, annuity, or pension of eight pounds of current and lawful money of England by the year, to the said Boulter Grierson, his heirs, executors, administrators, and assigns, from and immediately after the surrender of the said letters patent granted by our said late royal grandfather to the said George Grierson of the said Office, for and during the said term of forty years, at the two usual feasts in the year, that is to say, at the feast of St. Michael the Archangel, and Easter, by even and equal portions, to be paid out of the rents and revenues of our said realm of Ireland, by the hands of our Vice-Treasurer or Receiver-General, for the time being, upon the shewing of these our letters patent, or the enrolment thereof, without any other writ, warrant, or mandate, to be had or procured from us, our heirs, or successors, by the said Boulter Grierson, his executors, administrators, or assigns, or his or their deputy or deputies, of or for the same willing, and hereby strictly charging and commanding all and singular Mayors, Sheriffs, Constables, and all other our officers, ministers, and loving subjects, that they and every of them be aiding and assisting to the said Boulter Grierson, his executors, administrators, and assigns, and his and their deputy and deputies, in the execution of the said Office, and all other matters and things whatsoever contained in these our letters patent, provided always that this our grant, or any thing therein contained, shall not, in any wise, be repugnant or contrary to any grant made by us or any of our progenitors, to any of our printers within our Kingdom of Great Britain, or to any of their deputies or assigns, or any of them, provided always that these our letters patent be

inrolled in the Rolls of our High Court of Chancery, in our said Kingdom of Ireland, within the space of six months, next ensuing the date of these presents, although no express mention be made of the yearly value or certainty of the premises, or of any of the gifts or grants heretofore made by us, or any of our progenitors, to the said Boulter Grierson, of the premises. In witness whereof we have caused these our letters to be made patent. Witness our aforesaid Lieutenant-General and General Governor of our said Kingdom of Ireland, at Dublin, the twenty-seventh day of March, in the sixth year of our Reign.

Inrolled the twenty-seventh day of March, in the sixth year of the Reign of King George the Third.

No. XL.

Grant to GEORGE GRIERSON, of the Office of Printer to His Majesty for Ireland.

Upon Search, it appeareth that the Inrolment of a Grant remains of Record amongst the Rolls in the Rolls Office of his Majesty's High Court of Chancery in Ireland, of which the following is a Copy:—

GEORGE III. by the grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, King, Defender of the Faith, and so forth, to all unto whom these presents shall come, greeting: Whereas, by our royal letters patent under the great seal of our kingdom of Ireland, bearing date the 27th day of March, in the sixth year of our reign, and which was in the year of our Lord 1766, we did give and grant unto Boulter Grierson the office of printer-general within our said kingdom of Ireland; to hold the said office unto the said Boulter Grierson, his

executors, administrators, and assigns, for and during the term of forty years, to commence from the surrender of several other letters patent therein mentioned, and which were surrendered on the said 27th day of March, in the said sixth year of our reign. And whereas the said Boulter Grierson is since dead, and George Grierson, of the city of Dublin, Esq. son of the said Boulter Grierson, became, upon his death, entitled to the said office for the remainder of the said term of forty years: And whereas the said term of forty years is since expired: And whereas the said George Grierson hath humbly besought us to grant unto him, the said George Grierson, by our royal letters patent, the said office of printer-general within that part of the united kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland called Ireland, for the term, time, and space of forty years, to commence from the expiration of the said letters patent so granted to the said Boulter Grierson, and we being graciously pleased to condescend to his request, know ye therefore, that we, of our special grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, by and with the advice and consent of our right trusty and right entirely beloved cousin and counsellor Charles, Duke of Richmond, our Lieutenant-General and General-Governor of that part of our said kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and according to the tenor of his Royal Highness the Prince Regent's letter, in our name, and on our behalf, and under our privy signet, bearing date at his court at Carleton House, the 8th day of April, 1811, in the fifty-first year of our reign, and now inrolled in the rolls-office of our High Court of Chancery, in that part of our said united kingdom called Ireland, have given and granted, and by these presents we do give and grant the office of printer-general within that part of our said united kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland called Ireland, unto the said George Grierson, his executors, administrators, and assigns, for and during the term of forty years, to commence from the 27th day of March, in the year of our Lord 1806, with full power and authority for the imprinting in that part of our said united kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland called Ireland Bibles, in all sizes and volumes, Books of Common Prayer, and Singing Psalms, in all sizes and volumes, Psalters, Books

of the New Testament, in all sizes or volumes, Primers having the Catechism therein, the statutes of Parliament of the united kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, as well entire as abridged, the statutes of the Parliament of Ireland made while a Parliament sat in that part of our said united kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland called Ireland, proclamations, with all such our other printing as shall be published by authority of us, our heirs and successors, with all profits, commodities, advantages, pre-eminentes and privileges thereunto belonging, or in any wise appertaining, reserving nevertheless unto the Provost, Fellows, and Scholars of the College of the Holy and Undivided Trinity of Queen Elizabeth, near Dublin, a concurrent right of imprinting in Ireland Bibles, and all sizes of volumes, books of Common Prayer, and singing psalms in all sizes or volumes, Psalters, books of the New Testament, in all sizes or volumes, primers having catechism therein, and all other books which are, or may be, commanded by lawful authority to be used in divine service. And we do for us, our heirs and successors, forbid and prohibit, all and every, our subjects, and all persons whatsoever, besides the said George Grierson, his deputies, executors, administrators, and assigns, except as is herein before, from and after the date of the said letters patent, to imprint, within that part of our said united kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, called Ireland, any of the said books, volumes, statutes, proclamations, or any other such printing as shall be published as aforesaid, provided that nothing in the said letters patent contained shall prevent the sale or publication within that part of our said united kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, called Ireland, of Bibles, in all sizes or volumes, or of the books of the New Testament, in all sizes or volumes, which shall have been printed, by either of the Universities, in that part of our said united kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, called England; the said George Grierson, his executors, administrators, or assigns, to have an annuity, or yearly pension of eight pounds, for exercise of the said office, for and during the term of forty years, payable by half yearly payments, at the two usual feasts in the year, that is to say, the feast of St. Michael the Archangel, and Easter, by even and

equal portions, to be paid out of the rents and revenues of that part of our said united kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, called Ireland, at the receipt of our Exchequer in Ireland, by the hands of our vice-treasurer, or receiver-general for the time being. And we do, for us, our heirs and successors, give and grant to the said George Grierson, his executors, administrators, and assigns, and his and their deputy and deputies, during the continuance of the said term of forty years, full licence and authority that he and they may, within that part of our said united kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, called Ireland, as often as occasion shall require, take up such and so many skilful workmen in the trade, art, or mystery of printing, as he or they, in his or their discretion, shall think fit to work in the said trade, art, or mystery, for such reasonable wages as he, the said George Grierson, his executors, administrators, or assigns, shall appoint, and for so long a time as he or they shall want said workmen. And we do hereby, for us, our heirs and successors, strictly charge and command, all and singular Mayors, Sheriffs, Constables, and all others, our officers, ministers, and loving subjects, that they, and every of them, be aiding and assisting to the said George Grierson, his executors, administrators, and assigns, and his and their deputy and deputies, in the execution of the said office, and all other matters and things whatsoever, contained in these our letters patent, provided that this our grant, or any thing herein contained, shall not, in any wise, be repugnant or contrary to any grant already made by us, or any like grant to be made by us, our heirs or successors, to any of our printers within that part of our united kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, called Great Britain, or to any of their deputies or assigns, or any of them. Provided, lastly, that these our letters patent be enrolled in the rolls of our High Court of Chancery, in that part of our united kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, called Ireland, within the space of six months next ensuing the date of these presents, although no express mention be made of the yearly value, or certainty of the premises, or of any other gifts or grants heretofore made by us, or any of our progenitors, of the said George Grierson, of the premises. In witness

whereof, we have caused these our letters to be made patent. Witness our aforesaid Lieutenant-General, and General Governor of Ireland, at Dublin, the 3d day of August, in the 51st year of our reign.

Inrolled the 5th day of August 1811.

Upon Search, it appeareth that the Inrolment of a Grant of the Office of Printer General, from his late Majesty King James I. to John Francton, remains of Record amongst the Rolls in the Rolls Office of His Majesty's High Court of Chancery in Ireland, of which the following is a Copy:—

JACOBUS Dei gratia Angliae Scotiae Franciae ac Hiberniae Rex Fidei Defensor &c. omnibus ad quos praesentes literae per venerint salutem Sciatis quod nos de gratia nostra speciali ac ex certa scientia et mero motu nostris de assensu perdilecti et fidelis Consiliarii nostri Arthuri Chichester Militis Deputati nostri Generalis dicti Regni nostri Hiberniae tam pro et in consideratione boni et fidelis servitii per dilectum nobis Johannem Francton antehac impensi et imposterum impendendi quam pro diversis aliis bonis causis et considerationibus nos ad praesens specialiter moventibus dedimus et concessimus ac per praesentes pro nobis heredibus et successoribus nostris damus et concedimus praefato Johanni Francton Officium Typographi nostri Generalis Anglice the Office of our Printer General infra Regnum nostrum Hiberniae ac eidem Johanni Francton per praesentes pro nobis heredibus et successoribus nostris damus et concedimus plenam solam et integrum authoritatem et potestatem ad imprimendum omnes et omnimodos Libros Statutorum Grammaticas Anglice Grammars Prognosticationes Anglice

Almanacks Acta Parliamenti Proclamationes Injunctiones Biblia
 et Libros Novi Testamenti ac omnes alios libros quoscunque
 tam in lingua Anglicana Hibernica aut alia lingua quacunque qui
 per leges et constitutiones nostras sive aliquorum progenitorum
 nostrorum in Regno nostro Angliae imprimi et vendi debeant
 per aliquos Typographos sive Bibliopolas in dicto Regno nostro
 Angliae ratione alicujus Privilegii Licentiae authoritatis sive
 concessionis per nos vel aliquos progenitores nostros facti sive
 concessi quam aliter quomodocunque aut qui imposterum per
 mandatum licentiam privilegium sive authoritatem nostrorum
 heredum vel successorum ipsorum impressi fuerint et qui
 non contrarii repugnantes neque scandalosi legibus aut gu-
 bernationi nostris neque scandalosi nobis heredibus vel
 successoribus nostris nec alicui Magnatum sive aliis sub-
 ditis nostris dictorum Regnorum nostrorum Angliae Scotiae
 aut Hiberniae Ac ipsum praefatum Johannem Francton Typo-
 graphum nostrum generalem dicti regni Hiberniae fecimus
 constituimus et ordinavimus Ac per praesentes pro nobis here-
 dibus et successoribus nostris facimus constituimus et ordina-
 mus Habend. gaudend. occupand. et exercend. officium praed-
 dictum una cum omnibus proficiens commoditatibus advantagiis et
 preheminentiis et privilegiis eidem officio quoquomodo spec-
 tantibus sive pertinentibus praefato Johanni Francton et assig-
 natis suis per se vel per sufficientem deputatum suum vel de-
 putatos suos sufficientes quandiu idem Johannes Francton as-
 signati et deputati sui se bene gesserint in executione officii praed-
 dicti Ac ulterius de uberiori gratia nostra speciali ac ex certa
 scientia et mero motu nostris de assensu praedicto et pro con-
 siderationibus praedictis damus et concedimus per praesentes pro
 nobis heredibus et successoribus nostris praefatis Johanni
 Francton et assignatis suis quam diu se bene gesserint in officio
 praedicto ut prefertur plenam solam et integrum licentiam et
 authoritatem tam ligandi et tegendi quam venditioni exponendi
 edendi et vendendi omnes et singulos praedictos libros Acta
 Parliamenti Proclamationes et omnia et singula alia praemissa
 quaecunque ac omnes alios libros cujuscunque fuerint generis
 naturae vel speciei qui per leges injunctiones et ordinationes
 Regni nostri Angliae et Hiberniae venditioni exponi edi sive

vendi debeant aut possint sive iidem libri fuerint impressi
 facti sive ligati in dicto Regno nostro Angliae vel infra hoc
 Regnum Hiberniae vel in aliquo alio Regno quoconque in par-
 tibus ultra mare dummodo iidem non sunt contrarii repug-
 nantes neque scandalosi legibus aut gubernationi sive statui
 dictorum regnorum nostrorum versus nos heredes vel succes-
 sores nostros nec aliquem Magnatum vel al. subditorum nos-
 trorum dictorum Regnorum nostrorum Angliae Scotiae sive
 Hiberniae Quare volumus et authoritate nostra Regia prohi-
 bemus et inhibemus omnibus et singulis aliis subditis nostris
 quibuscunque ubivis gentium aut locorum et ceteris aliis quibus-
 cunque praeter predictum Johannem Francton assignatos et de-
 putatos suos quod ipsi nec eorum aliquis per se vel alium durante
 bono gestu praefati Johannis Francton assignatorum et deputato-
 rum suorum ut praefertur imprimant ligent tegant edant vendi-
 tioni exponant aut vendant aut imprimi ligari tegi edi venditioni
 exponi aut vendi faciant aut causabunt aut eorum aliquis fecerit
 aut causabit infra dictum Regnum nostrum Hiberniae aliquos li-
 bros codices Volumina Statuta Proclamations Prognosticationes
 aut aliquem alium librum vel libros impressos vel imprimendos
 sine licentia praefati Johannis Francton aut assignatorum suorum
 sub poena Forisfacturae decem Solidorum Currentis Monetae
 Hiberniae pro quolibet tali libro volumine vel alia re quacunque
 sic impresso ligato tecto edito venditioni exposito aut vendito
 ac sub poena forisfacturae confiscationis et amissionis talium li-
 brorum voluminum et operum quorumcunque et eorum cuius-
 libet ad solum et proprium opus et usum ipsius Johannis Franc-
 ton et assignat. suorum Ac insuper de ampliori gratia nostra
 speciali ac ex certa scientia et mero motu nostris pro nobis et suc-
 cessoribus nostris damus et concedimus praefato Johanni
 Francton et assignatis suis plenam authoritatem et potestatem
 arrestandi apprehendendi capiendi aut seisandi omnes et singu-
 los tales libros volumina materias et res quascunque sic impres-
 sas ligat. tect. edit. venditioni exposit. aut vendit. vel durante
 bono gestu ipsius Johannis Francton assignatorum et deputato-
 rum suorum ut praefertur contra tenorem praesentium im-
 primendi ligandi tegendi edendi venditioni exponendi aut
 vendendi infra dictum Regnum nostrum Hiberniae et sicut

praemittitur forisfact. et confiscand. et eosdem ad opus et usum
 dicti Johannis Francton et assignatorum suorum imperpetuum
 Tenend. et gaudend. sine impedimento interruptione contradic-
 tione sive perturbatione nostra sive aliarum personarum quarum-
 cunque Proviso semper quod haec nostra concessio nec aliqua in
 eadem contenta non extendat ad inhibendum aut prohibendum
 aliquam personam sive personas qui imposterum habebit vel ob-
 tinebit habebunt sive obtinebunt aliquam licentiam sive autho-
 ritatem de nobis heredibus vel successoribus nostris vel de De-
 putato nostro Generali sive alio Capitali Gubernatore nostro
 heredum et successorum nostrorum dicti Regni nostri Hiberniae
 ad ligandum et tegendum aliquos libros sed quod ipsi et eorum
 quilibet hujusmodi licentiam et autoritatem habentes et ob-
 tinens. bene et legitime ligare et tegere quoscunque libros pos-
 sint et possit absque aliquo impedimento interruptione sive
 molestatione praedicti Johannis Francton aut assignatorum suo-
 rum aut aliorum quorumcunque aliqua re clausula vel sententia
 in his praesentibus contenta in contrarium non obstante. Ac
 insuper de ampliori gratia nostra speciali ac ex certa scientia
 et mero motu nostris de assensu praedicto et pro consideratione
 praedicta concessimus et licentiam dedimus ac per praesentes
 pro nobis heredibus et successoribus nostris damus et licen-
 tiam concedimus praefato Johanni Francton et assignatis et
 deputatis suis quod ipsi et eorum quilibet de tempore in tempus
 durante bono gestu ipsius Johannis Francton et assignatorum
 suorum ut praefertur operarios de arte et mysterio Typogra-
 phorum et Bibliopolarum capere apprehendere et conducere
 possit et possint ad operandum in arte praedicta pro rationabi-
 libus vadio et stipendio ad appunctuandum et assignationem praefati
 Johannis Francton deputatorum et assignatorum suorum pro
 tali tempore et talibus temporibus durante quo vel quibus idem
 Johannes Francton deputati vel assignati sui hujusmodi opera-
 rios egebit vel egebunt. Ac ulterius de uberiori gratia nostra
 speciali ac ex certa scientia et mero motu nostris dedimus et
 concessimus ac per praesentes pro nobis heredibus et successo-
 ribus nostris damus et concedimus praefato Johanni Francton
 et assignatis suis pro exercitio officii praedicti quoddam
 feodium Vadium Stipendum annuitatem sive annualem pensio-

nem Octo Librarum Ster. currentis monetae Angliae per annum praefato Johanni Francton et assignatis suis a festo paschae ultimo praeterito ante datum praesentium quamdiu idem Johannes Francton et assignati sui se bene gesserint in officio praedicto ad duos anni terminos viz. ad festa sancti Michaelis Archangeli et Paschae peraequales portiones solvendum de Redditibus et Reventionibus dicti Regni nostri Hibernie ad Receptum Scaccarii nostri dicti Regni nostri Hibernie per manus Vicethes aurarii nostri heredibus et successoribus ipsorum in dicto Regno nostro Hibernie pro tempore existente super solam demonstrationem harum literarum nostrarum Patentium vel irrotulamenti earumdem absque aliquo alio brevi warranto seu mandato a nobis heredibus vel successoribus nostris per praefatum Johannem Francton vel assignatos suos quoquomodo obtinendo vel persequendo Mandamus etiam et per praesentes firmiter injungimus et praeципimus omnibus et singulis Majoribus Vicecomitibus Ballivis Constabulariis et aliis officiariis Ministris et subditis nostris quibusunque quod praefato Johanni Francton deputatis et assignatis suis in executione officii praedicti ac omnibus et singulis in his literis nostris patentibus specificatis agendis de tempore in tempus quando necessarium fuerit sint attendantes intendantes pariter et auxiliantes in omnibus prout decet Eo quod expressa mentio de vero valore annuo aut de ceteris praemissis seu eorum alicujus aut de aliquibus aliis donis sive concessis per nos aut per aliquem progenitorum nostrorum eidem Johanni Francton antehac tempora factis in praesentibus minime factis existit aliquo Statuto Actu Ordinatione sive promisso aut aliqua alia re causa vel materia quacunque in contrarium promissa facta in aliquo non obstante In cuius rei testimon. has literas nostras fieri fecimus Patentes Teste praefato Deputato nostro generali Regni nostri Hibernie apud Dublin. tertio die Maii Anno Regni nostri Anglie Francie et Hibernie Septimo et Scotie Quadragesimo Secundo.

Per breve de privato sigillo.

From the *Irish Term Reports*, vol. i. p. 304, Dub. 1796.

CHANCERY.

July 28th 1794.

GRIERSON AGAINST JACKSON.

JAMESON for the plaintiff, on the 26th instant, moved for an injunction to stop the defendant from printing an edition of the Bible in numbers. The bill stated, that by letters patent 6 Geo. 3. the sole power of printing and selling Bibles was granted to *Boulter Grierson*, who devised it to the plaintiff; that the defendant, in violation of this grant, is printing an edition of the Bible in numbers, at one shilling each number, with prints, and he says in his answer, that this edition is accompanied with the annotations of learned men, and therefore he does not infringe the patent, and that the law and practice of *England* is so.

Lord CHANCELLOR (*CLARE*.) I believe he may be right. I should be unwilling to stop the printing an edition of the Bible in numbers; it may be very useful.—Has the validity of this patent ever been established at law?—I do not know that the Crown has a right to erect a monopoly of that kind.

JAMESON. The law formerly was, that when a patentee or person at common law, claimed an exclusive right to any work of genius, or art, he filed a bill against the person infringing that right for an account of the profits, and upon the first opening of the case, the party was sent to law to establish his right, and then came back for an account. But that is long since disused, and the practice of *Chancery* now is, to receive motions for injunctions, without trying the title at law. *Dodsley v. Kinnersley*, *Ambl.* 403.—The defendant here admits he did not ask the consent of the patentee; he says he did not think it necessary to do so; but he cannot print this work without such consent. The injunction in *Ambl.* was refused, because the *Master of the Rolls*

said he would not grant it against mere partial extracts from a work ; but he entertained the motion without any previous trial at law : he said, " I would have it understood, that there is no impropriety in the application to this Court. The method of proceeding in these cases has been changed."—The right of an author to his work must be the same in law, as the right of a patentee claiming under the prerogative grant. In *Macklin v. Richardson, Ambl.* 694, an injunction was granted at the suit of the author against publishing a farce in a magazine, and there the right was not tried at law. *Bell v. Walker and Debret, 1 Bro. Cha. Cas.* 452, motion for an injunction to restrain the defendant from publishing the life of Mrs. Bellamy, stating it to be a piracy from another work ; the answer had not come in ; but upon the motion extracts from each work were read, to show that in many instances one was *verbatim* a copy from the other.—The *Master* of the *Rolls* granted the motion, though there was no trial at law.—The defendant says, his Majesty has an exclusive right and prerogative to print the text of the Bible, but if additions are made to the work by ingenuity and comment, that is no infringement of the prerogative. In *Carnan v. Bowles 2 Bro. Cha. Cas.* 80, the compiler of a book of roads sold his interest in the work to a printer, and at the end of fourteen years, prepared a new edition in which some parts were altered ; this latter work he sold to another printer, but an injunction was granted against printing such part as remained unaltered ; so here the plaintiff desires an injunction only against printing the text of the Bible. 1. *Bl. Rep.* 370, *Basket v. Cunningham*, the defendant was publishing a digest of the statutes with large notes, a bill was filed for an injunction, which was granted upon motion, because the notes appeared to be collusive.

LORD CHANCELLOR. I can very well conceive that the King should have a power to grant a patent to print the statute books, because it is necessary that there should be a responsibility for correct printing, and because the copy can be had only from the rolls of parliament, which are within the authority of the Crown. I can conceive, that the King, as the head of the Church, may say, there shall be but one man who shall print

Bibles and books of common prayer for the use of Churches and other particular purposes, and that none other shall be deemed correct books for such purposes. *But I cannot conceive that the King has any prerogative to grant a monopoly as to Bibles for the instruction of mankind in revealed religion.* If he had, it would be in the power of the patentee to put what price he pleased upon the book, and thus prevent the instruction of men in the Christian religion. *The patent could not mean to give an exclusive right in the printing of Bibles.* It stands upon perfectly distinct ground from the copy-right of an author.—Suppose a man was indicted for blasphemy, or ridiculing religion, it is right that no book should be received in evidence but such as is printed by the King's printer. It is very necessary that it should be so, to the end, that there may be one common repository of an authentic copy. But the patent can go no further; at least upon a motion, I would not determine that it did.

BURSTON, for the defendant. There is a prerogative copy-right vested in the Crown for certain reasons. The King has a right to print exclusively all acts of parliament, proclamations, and orders of council; 2dly, as supreme head of the Church, he has a right to print Bibles. 2. *Bl. Com.*—As supreme head of the Church it is necessary he should have that right; it is necessary for the purity of the faith, that the sources should be preserved untainted. Besides the King has an interest, because it is well known that the translation of the Bible was carried on at the King's expense.

LORD CHANCELLOR. I should very much doubt the principle of Judge *Blackstone's* reasoning, for if the King acquired any distinct right by the purchase of the translation, it would go in the line of representation, not in succession.

BURSTON. It was an act done as King, and as head of the Church. The printing this edition of the Bible can do no injury; annotations are annexed, taken from works of character, and that does not infringe upon the patent, supposing it to be valid.

LORD CHANCELLOR. If ever there was a time which called aloud for the dissemination of religious knowledge, it is this; and therefore I should with very great reluctance determine in

favour of such a monopoly as this, which must necessarily confine the circulation of this book. If *Mr. Grierson* insists upon this right, he may try it at law, and then come here to stop the work from going on.

DUNN, for the defendant. There is a case in 1 *Vern.* 120, where the Chancellor sent the party to a Court of law, before he would interfere. From that time no change has taken place upon that subject but this:—a doubt was entertained by many lawyers, whether copy-right was a common law right; it has been since determined, that there is no such thing as a common law copy-right. The position in *Blackstone* was before the determination by *De Grey*.

LORD CHANCELLOR. There is one circumstance which is very strong against *Mr. Grierson*. There are very many editions of the Bible. Now is it to be conceived, that if this prerogative of the Crown, which for certain purposes confessedly exists, extended to give the patentees the sole and exclusive privilege of that book, and prevented every other person from printing a copy, that down to this time from *James I.* the King's printer would suffer such a number of editions, without stopping them? There are editions every day in *England*. At present there is an edition printing by *Macklin*, which is a most magnificent work. The only difference between it and this is, that this appears to be upon bad paper and worked with a bad type; *Macklin's* is a most beautiful paper and type. I have no doubt that it would be an high misdemeanor to print Bibles incorrectly; and as to very particular purposes, I have no doubt that *Mr. Grierson* has an exclusive right to print Bibles and Prayer Books, but unless I am bound down very strictly, I will not determine upon motion, that no man but the King's printer has right to print such works as these.

The motion stood over until the next day.

LORD CHANCELLOR. I have been looking into this question, and I find that I cannot grant this injunction. *Mr. Grierson* states, that he has had for forty years the exclusive right of printing Bibles, common Prayer Books, &c. under a patent from the Crown. I do not know that the validity of such patents

has ever been established at common law. In the case of *Hills v. the University of Oxford*, 1 *Vern.* 275, a bill was brought to restrain the defendants from printing Bibles. The defendants pleaded a patent granted 8 *Car.* 1. giving a power to print Bibles and other books not prohibited. The Chancellor said, that the validity of the patents was a question triable at common law, and he directed an action to be brought in the Court of *Kings Bench*, and in another case in the same book, p. 120, upon a motion for an injunction to stop the sale of Bibles printed beyond sea, the *Lord Chancellor* directed a trial at law, after which they might come back to him. In 1 *Hawk. P. C.* c. 79, s. 6, he says, "also it seems to be the better opinion, that the King may grant to particular persons the sole use of some particular employments (as of printing the holy Scriptures and law books,) whereof an unrestrained liberty might be of dangerous consequence."—And in a note it is said, "that the reasons given are, that the invention of printing was new; that it concerned the state and was matter of public care; that it was in the nature of a proclamation, and none could make proclamations but the King."—If these were the reasons upon which the doctrine was founded, I do not think they will support him. At common law the King might grant a patent for any length of time for the encouragement of trade; but by a particular statute this is now restrained to fourteen years.—Till *Mr. Grierson* brings an action at law, I cannot take upon me to decide this question, from the authority of *Hills v. the University of Oxford*, and of that other case in *Vernon*, and it may be observed, that in these cases, the parties never came back, that I can find, into the Court of *Chancery*.

DUNN, for the defendant. In *Vin. abr.* 17 vol. 209, there is a note which doubts the opinion of *Hawkins*.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL, DUQUERY, and EWING, for the plaintiff.—The note in *Vin.* was an angry opinion of the compiler, who was exasperated with the printer about something relative to his work.—In 1 *Alk.* 284, the rule as to the necessity of a trial at law is restrained. The *Lord Chancellor* says, it is a general rule, that a man shall not come into a Court of Equity to establish a legal right, unless he has tried his title at law, if he

can : but this is not so general an objection, as always to prevail.

LORD CHANCELLOR. Take up the question on this ground :— The King grants a sole right to print Bibles for forty years : if this be valid, the King is restrained during that time from granting another patent, and the patentee has a monopoly for that term. Now see whether if the Crown may restrain its subjects from printing, its own power, tied up thus for forty years, can stand in a Court of law. It appears from the cases in *Vernon*, that a power granted by the Crown may be revoked in part by granting part of the same power to another. To be sure the Crown must have some power of granting patents ; but consider whether that power committed to the Crown for necessary purposes may be entirely tied up for forty years. It is of necessity, that the Crown should have the power of licensing Bibles, which alone shall be used in places of public worship, and you could not give in evidence in a Court of law any Bible not licensed. But it is a different question, whether an exclusive patent for forty years is not in itself a deception on the King, and does not restrain the power of the Crown to such a degree as ought to be controlled.

The counsel for the plaintiff then cited *Hawk.* 352, where the office of King's printer was granted for thirty years.—7 *Bro. P. C.* 88, where all the cases of injunctions upon this subject are cited. The opinion of Justice *Blackstone* is in favour of the plaintiff.

LORD CHANCELLOR. Mr. Justice *Blackstone* was certainly a very ingenious man, and his book has great merit considered as a book of lectures delivered in an University. But his commentaries are not authority, and if any man looks into his chapter of *Remitter*, he will see it.

The motion again stood over, and this day

The ATTORNEY GENERAL mentioned a case in *Lucas* 105, and 2 *Show.* 258, *Stationers' Company v. Lee*, which comes nearer the present case than any other, and there it was held that the Crown had a prerogative right in all copies of the Bible.—If, however, it be necessary to determine this matter at law, it will

save time and expence to direct an issue, or send a case to a Court of law.

LORD CHANCELLOR. That must be done upon the hearing of the cause, unless both parties consent. The cases which have been mentioned seem to intimate, that it never has been solemnly decided, how far the prerogative extends to give a sole and exclusive right of printing Bibles. In the cases in *I Vern.* which I mentioned before, the right was directed to be tried at law, but I do not find that the cases ever came back into *Chancery*. In *2 Atk. 485*, *Lord Hardwicke* lays it down, that *Chancery* never tries a right claimed under a charter. There are innumerable copies of Bibles printed in both countries. *Mr. Macklin* is now printing a superb edition, copies of which are sent here from *England*, and there has been no suit against him by the King's printer. Many of the old cases upon this subject were determined upon the principle of the licensing act.

No rule.

No. XLI.

The Second Book of Discipline ; or Heads and Conclusions of the Policy of the Kirk, agreed upon in the General Assembly 1578, inserted in the Registers of Assembly 1581, sworn to in the National Covenant, revised and ratified by the Assembly 1638, and by many other Acts of Assembly. And according to which the Church Government is established by law 1592 and 1690.

CHAP. I.

Of the Kirk, and Policy thereof in General, and wherein it is different from the Civil Policy.

THE Kirk of God sometimes is largely taken, for all them that profess the Evangel of Jesus Christ ; and so it is a Company and Fellowship, not only of the Godly, but also of Hypocrites, professing always outwardly the true Religion, Other Times it is taken for the Godly and Elect only ; and sometimes for them that exercise spiritual Function in the Congregation of them that profess the Truth.

2. The Kirk in this last Sense hath a certain Power granted by God, according to the which it uses a proper Jurisdiction and Government, exercised to the Comfort of the whole Kirk. This Power Ecclesiastical is an Authority granted by God the Father, through the Mediator Jesus Christ, unto his Kirk gathered, and having Ground in the Word of God ; to be put in Execution by them, unto whom the spiritual Government of the Kirk, by lawful Calling, is committed.

3. The Policy of the Kirk, flowing from this Power, is an Order or Form of spiritual Government, which is exercised by the Members appointed thereto by the Word of God ; and therefore

is given immediately to the Office-bearers, by whom it is exercised, to the Good of the whole Body.

This Power is diversly used, for sometimes it is severally exercised, chiefly by the Teachers; sometime conjunctly, by mutual Consent of them that bear the Office and Charge, after the Form of Judgment. The former is commonly called *Potestas Ordinis*, and the other *Potestas Jurisdictionis*.

These two Kinds of Power have both one Authority, one Ground, one final Cause; but are different in the Manner and Form of Execution, as is evident, by the Speaking of our Master in the 16th and 18th of *Matthew*.

4. This Power and Policy Ecclesiastical, is different and distinct, in the own Nature, from that Power and Policy which is called Civil power, and appertaineth to the Civil Government of the Commonwealth: Albeit they be both of God, and tend to one End, if they be rightly used, *viz.* to advance the Glory of God, and to have godly and good Subjects.

5. For this Power Ecclesiastical floweth immediately from God, and the Mediator Jesus Christ, and is spiritual, not having a temporal Head on the Earth, but only Christ, the only spiritual King and Governor of his Kirk.

6. It is a Title falsely usurped by Antichrist, to call himself Head of the Kirk; and ought not to be attributed to Angel, nor Man, of what Estate soever he be, saving to Christ the only Head and Monarch in the Kirk.

7. Therefore this Power and Policy of the Kirk should lean upon the Word immediately, as the only Ground thereof, and should be taken from the pure Fountains of the Scriptures, the Kirk hearing the Voice of Christ the only spiritual King, and being ruled by his Laws.

8. It is proper to Kings, Princes and Magistrates, to be called Lords, and Dominators over their Subjects, whom they govern civilly: But it is proper to Christ only to be called Lord and Master, in the spiritual Government of the Kirk; and all others, that bear Office therein, ought not to usurp Dominion therein, nor be called Lords, but only Ministers, Disciples and Servants For it is Christ's proper Office to command and rule

his Kirk universally ; and every particular Kirk, through his Spirit and Word, by the Ministry of Men.

9. Notwithstanding, as the Ministers, and others of the Ecclesiastical Estate, are subject to the Magistrate Civil, so ought the Person of the Magistrate be subject to the Kirk spiritually, and in Ecclesiastical Government. And the Exercise of both these Jurisdictions cannot stand in one Person ordinarily.

The Civil Power is called the Power of the Sword, and the other the Power of the Keys.

10. The Civil Power should command the Spiritual to exercise, and to do their Office according to the Word of God ; the spiritual Rulers should require the Christian Magistrate to minister Justice and punish Vice, and to maintain the Liberty and Quietness of the Kirk within their Bounds.

11. The Magistrate commandeth external Things, for external Peace, and Quietness amongst the Subjects : The Minister handleth external Things only for Conscience Cause.

12. The Magistrate handleth external Things only, and Actions done before Men ; but the spiritual Ruler judgeth both inward Affections, and external Actions, in Respect of Conscience, by the Word of God.

13. The Civil Magistrate craves and gets Obedience by the Sword, and other external Means : But the Ministry, by the spiritual Sword, and spiritual means.

14. The Magistrate neither ought to preach, minister the Sacraments, nor execute the Censures of the Kirk, nor yet prescribe any rule how it should be done, but command the Ministers to observe the Rule commanded in the Word, and punish the Transgressors by civil Means. The Ministers exercise not the Civil Jurisdiction, but teach the Magistrate how it should be exercised according to the Word.

15. The Magistrate ought to assist, maintain and fortify the Jurisdiction of the Kirk. The Ministers should assist their Princes, in all Things agreeable to the Word, providing they neglect not their own Charge, by involving themselves in Civil Affairs.

Finally, as Ministers are subject to the judgment and Punishment of the Magistrate, in external Things, if they offend

so ought the Magistrates to submit themselves to the Discipline of the Kirk, if they transgress in Matters of Conscience and Religion.

CHAP. II. *Of the parts of the Policy of the Kirk, and Persons or Office-Bearers, to whom the Administration is committed.*

As in the Civil Policy, the whole Common-wealth consisteth in them that are Governors, or Magistrates ; and them that are governed, or Subjects : So in the Policy of the Kirk, some are appointed to be Rulers, and the rest of the Members thereof to be ruled, and obey according to the Word of God, and Inspiration of his Spirit, always under one Head and Chief Governor, Jesus Christ.

2. Again, The whole Policy of the Kirk consisteth in three Things, *viz.* in Doctrine, Discipline, and Distribution. With Doctrine, is annexed the Administration of Sacraments ; and, according to the Parts of this Division, ariseth a threefold Sort of Officers in the Kirk, *to wit*, of Ministers or Preachers, Elders or Governours, and Deacons or Distributers.

3. And all these may be called by a general Word, Ministers of the Kirk : For albeit the Kirk of God be ruled and governed by Jesus Christ, who is the only King, High-priest, and Head thereof, yet he useth the Ministry of Men, as the most necessary Mids for this Purpose. * * * * *

6. There are four ordinary Functions or Offices in the Kirk of God, the Office of the Pastor, Minister or Bishop ; the Doctor, the Presbyter or Elder, and the Deacon.

7. These Offices are ordinary, and ought to continue perpetually in the Kirk, as necessary for the Government and Policy thereof, and no more Offices ought to be received or suffered in the true Kirk of God, established according to his Word.

8. Therefore all the ambitious Titles, invented in the Kingdom of Antichrist, and in his usurped Hierarchy, which are not of one of these four Sorts, together with the Offices depending thereupon, in one Word, ought utterly to be rejected.

CHAP. VII. *Of the Elderships, Assemblies and Discipline.*

ELDERSHIPS and Assemblies are commonly constitute of Pastors, Doctors, and such as we commonly call Elders, that labour not in the Word and Doctrine; of whom, and of whose several Power, hath been spoken.

2. Assemblies are of four Sorts. For either they are of particular Kirks and Congregations one or mo, or of a Province, or of a whole Nation, or of all and divers Nations professing one Jesus Christ.

3. All the Ecclesiastical Assemblies have Power to conveen lawfully together, for treating of Things concerning the Kirk, and pertaining to their Charge.

They have Power to appoint Times and Places to that Effect; and at one Meeting, to appoint the Diet, Time and Place for another.

4. In all Assemblies a Moderator should be chosen by common consent of the whole brethren convened, who should propone matters, gather the votes, and cause good order to be kept in the Assemblies.

Diligence should be taken, chiefly by the Moderator, that only Ecclesiastical Things be handled in the Assemblies; and that there be no meddling with any Thing pertaining to the Civil Jurisdiction.

6. The final End of Assemblies, is, *First*, To keep Religion and Doctrine in Purity, without Error and Corruption. *Next*, To keep Comeliness and good Order in the Kirk.

7. For this Order's Cause, they may make certain Rules and Constitutions, appertaining to the good Behaviour of all the Members of the Kirk, in their vocation.

8. They have Power also to abrogate and abolish all Statutes and Ordinances, concerning Ecclesiastical Matters, that are found noisom and unprofitable, and agree not with the Time, or are abused by the People.

9. They have Power to execute Ecclesiastical Discipline and Punishment upon all Transgressors, and proud Contemners of the good Order and Policy of the Kirk ; and so the whole Discipline is in their Hands.

12. It pertains to the Eldership (Presbytery) to take heed, that the Word of God be purely preached within their Bounds, the Sacraments rightly ministred, the Discipline rightly maintained, and the Ecclesiastical Goods uncorruptly distributed.

21. The National Assembly, which is General to us, is a lawful Convention of the whole Kirks of the Realm or Nation, where it is used and gathered, for the common Affairs of the Kirk, and may be called the General Eldership of the whole Kirks in the Realm.

24. This Assembly should take heed, that the spiritual Jurisdiction, and Civil, be not confounded, to the Hurt of the Kirk ; that the Patrimony of the Kirk be not consumed, nor abused : And generally concerning all weighty Affairs, that concern the Well and good Order of the whole Kirks of the Realm, it ought to interpose Authority thereto.

CHAP. X. *Of the Office of a Christian Magistrate, in the Kirk.*

1. ALTHOUGH all the Members of the Kirk be holden, every one in their Vocation, and according thereto, to advance the Kingdom of Jesus Christ, so far as lieth in their Power ; yet chiefly Christian Princes, and other Magistrates, are holden to do the same. For they are called in the Scripture, Nourishers of the Kirk, for so much as by them it is, or at least ought to be Maintained, Fostered, Upholden, and Defended against all that would procure the Hurt thereof.

2. So it pertains to the Office of a Christian Magistrate, to assist and fortifie, the godly Proceedings of the Kirk, in all Behalfs ; and namely, to see that the publick Estate and Ministry thereof be maintained and sustained, as it appertains, according to God's Word.

3. To see that the Kirk be not invaded, nor hurt by false Teachers, and Hirelings ; nor the Roomes thereof be occupied by dumb Dogs or idle Bellies.

4. To assist and maintain the Discipline of the Kirk, and punish them civilly, that will not obey the Censure of the same, without confounding always the one Jurisdiction with the other.

5. To see that sufficient Provision be made for the Ministry, the Schools, and the Poor: And if they have not sufficient to await upon their Charges, to supply their Indigence even with their own Rents, if need require. To hold Hand as well to the saving of their Persons from Injury and open Violence, as to their rents and Possessions, that they be not defrauded, robbed, nor spoiled thereof.

6. Nor to suffer the Patrimony of the Kirk to be applied to profane and unlawful Uses, or to be devoured by idle Bellies, and such as have no lawful Function in the Kirk, to the Hurt of the Ministry, Schools, Poor, and other godly Uses, whereupon the same ought to be bestowed.

7. To make Laws and Constitutions agreeable to God's Word, for Advancement of the Kirk, and Policy thereof, without usurping any thing that pertains not to the civil Sword, but belongs to the Offices that are meerly Ecclesiastical, as is the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments, using Ecclesiastical Discipline, and the Spiritual Execution thereof, or any Part of the Power of the Spiritual Keys, which our Master gave to the Apostles, and to their true Successors.

And although Kings and Princes that be godly, sometimes by their own Authority, when the Kirk is corrupted, and all Things out of Order, place Ministers, and restore the true Service of the Lord, after the Example of some godly Kings of Judah, and divers godly Emperors, and Kings also, in the Light of the New Testament. Yet, where the Ministry of the Kirk is once lawfully constitute, and they that are placed do their Office

faithfully, all godly Princes and Magistrates ought to hear and obey their Voice, and reverence the Majesty of the Son of God speaking by them.

No. XLII.

X. Ratification of the Libertie of the trew Kirk ; of General and Synodical Assemblies ; of Presbyteries ; of Discipline. All Laws of Idolatrie are abrogate : Presentation to Benefices.

At Edinburgh, Junii 15, 1592.

OVR Soueraine Lord, and Estaites of this present Parliament, following the lovabil and gude Exemple of their Predecessoures, hes ratified and appreeved, and be the Tenour of this present Act, ratifies and apprevis all Liberties, Priviledges, Immunities and Freedomes quhatsumeuer, given and granted be his Hienesse, his Regentes in his Name, or onie of his Predecessours, to the trew and halie Kirk, presentlie established within this Realme, and declared in the first Acte of his Hienesse Parliament, the twentie day of October, the zeir of GOD, ane thousand, five hundred, threescoir ninetene zeires : And all and quhatsumeuer Actes of Parliament, and Statutes maid of before, be his Hienesse, and his Regentes ; Anent the libertie and freedome of the said Kirk : And speciallie, the first Acte of Parliament, halden at Edinburgh, the twentie fourre daie of October, the zeir of God, ane thousand, five hundred, four-score ane zeires, With the haill particular Actes there mentioned : Quhilk salbe als sufficient, as gif the samin were here expressed : And all uther Actes of Parliament made sensine in Favour of the trew Kirk : And sik like, ratifies and appreuiis, the general Assemblies appoyneted be the said Kirk : And declaris, that it sal be lauchfull to the Kirk and Ministers, euerie zeir at the least, and often *pro re nata*, as occasion and necesstie sal require, to hald and kepe general Assemblies, providing,

that the Kings Majestie, or his Commissioners, with them to be appointed be his hienesse, be present at ilk general Assemblie, before the dissoluing thereof, nominate and appoyn特 time and place, quhen and quhair the next general Assemblie sal be halden : And in case naither his Majestie, nor his said Commissioners beis present for the time in that Toun, quhair the said general Assemblie beis halden, then, and in that case it sal be lesum to the said general Assemblie, be themselues, to nominate and appoyn特 time and place, quhair the nixt general Assemblie of the Kirk salbe keiped and halden, as they haue bene in vse to do thir times by-past. And als ratifies and appreuis the Synodall and Prouinciall Assemblies, to be halden be the said Kirk and Ministers twise ilk zeir, as they haue bene, and are presentlie in Vse to do, within everie province of this Realme : And ratifies and appreevis the Presbyteries, and particular Sessiones appointed be the said Kirk, with the haill jurisdiction and discipline of the same Kirk, agried vpon be his Majestie in conference, had, be his Hienesse, with certaine of the Ministers, conveened to that effect : Of the quhilks artickles, the tenour follows. Maters to be intreated in Provincial assemblies : Thir assemblies are constitute for weichtie matters, necessar to be intreated be mutual consent and assistance of brethren, within the Province, as neede requiris. This assemblie has power to handle, crdour and redresse all things omitted or done amis in the particular assemblies. It hes power to depose the office-beareres of that Province, for gude and just cause, deserving deprivation : And generallie, thir assemblies hes the hail power of the particular Elderschips quhairof they are collected. Maters to be intreated in the Presbyteries. The power of the Presbyteries is to giue diligent Laboures in the boundes committed to their charge ; That the Kirkes be keeped in gude ordour ; to inquire diligentlie of naughtie and ungodlie persons ; and to travel to bring them in the way again be admonition, or threatning of Gods judgments, or be correction. It appertaines to the Elderschipse, to take heede, that the word of God be purelie preached within their boundes, the Sacramentes richtlie ministred, the Discipline interteined, and Ecclesiastical gudes vncorruptlie distributed. It belangis to

this kind of assemblies, to cause the ordinances maid by the Assemblies, Provincialles, Nationalles, and Generalles, to be keeped and put in execution, to make constitutions, quhilk concernis τὸ πεῖπον in the Kirk, for decent ordour, in the particular Kirk quhair they governe: Providing that they alter na rules maid be the Prouinciall or Generall assemblies; and that they make the Provinciall assemblies foresaid privie of the rules that they sall make; and to abolish constitutiones, tending to the hurt of the same. It hes power to excommunicate the obstinate, formal Process being led, and dew intervall of times obserued. Anent Particular Kirks, gif they be lauchfullie ruled, be sufficient Ministerie and Session; they have power and jurisdiction in their owen Congregation, in maters Ecclesiasticall. And decernis and declaris the saides Assemblies, Presbyteries and Sessiounes, Jurisdiction and Discipline thereof foresaid, to be in all times cumming maist just, gude, and godlie in the self, Not-with-standing of quhatsumever Statutes, Actes, Canone, Civill, or Municipall Lawes, made in the contrare. To the quhilkis, and everie ane of them, thir Presentes sall make expresse derogation. And, because there ar diuers actes of Parliament, maid in Fauour of the Papisticall Kirk, tending to the prejudice of the libertie of the trew Kirk of God, presentlie professed within this Realme, jurisdiction and discipline thereof; Quhilk stands zit in the buikes of the actes of Parliament, nocht abrogated nor annulled; Therefore his Hienesse, and Estaites foresaides, hes abrogated, cassed, and annulled; and bee the tenour hereof, abrogatis, cassis and annullis all Actes of Parliament maid be onie of his Hienesse predecessoures, for Maintenance of superstition and idolatrie, with all and quhatsum-euer Actes, lawes and statutes, maid at onie time, before the daie and dait hereof, against the libertie of the trew Kirk, jurisdiction and discipline theirof, as the samin is vsed and exercised within this Realme.

And in special, that Part of the Act of Parliament, halden at Striviling, the Fourt Day of Nouember, the zeir of God, ane thousand four hundred fortie three zeirs, commaunding obedience to be given to Eugenius the Paipe for the time: The acte maid be King James the third, in his Parliament halden at

Edinburgh, the twentie four day of Februar, the zeir of God, ane thousand four hundredth, four scoir zeires. And all vtheris actes, quhairby the Paipis authoritie is established. The Acte of King James the thrid, in his Parliament halden at Edinburgh, the twentie daie of November, the zeir of God, ane thousand, four hundredth, three scoir nine zeires, anent the Satterday, and vther vigiles to be hailie daies, from Euen-sang to Euen-sang.

Item, That pairt of the act, maid be the Queene Regent, in the Parliament halden at Edinburgh, the first day of Februar, The zeir of God, ane thousand, fife hundredth fiftie ane zeires, giuing speciall licence, for halding of Pasche and Zule. *Item*, The Kingis Majestie and Estaites foresaidis, declaris, that the 129. Acte of the Parliament, halden at Edinburgh, the xxii. day of Maij, the zeir of God, 1584 Zeirs, sall na wise be prejudicall, nor derogate onie thing to the priuiledge that God hes giuen to the spiritual office-bearers in the Kirk, concerning heads of Religion, maters of Heresie, Excommunication, Collation or Depriuation of Ministers, or ony siklike essential Censours, speciallie grounded, and hauand warrand of the Word of God. *Item*, Our Soveraine Lord, and Estaites of Parliament foresaidis, abrogatis, cassis, and annullis, the Act of the same Parliament, halden at Edinburgh, the said zeir, 1584 zeires, granting Commission to Bischopps, and vtheris Judges, constitute in Ecclesiastical causes, to receiue his Hienesse presentationes to benefices, to giue collation thereupon ; And to put ordour in al causes Ecclesiastical, quhilk his Majestie and Estaites foresaidis, declaris to be expired in the self, and to be null in time cumming, and of nane availl, Force nor Effect. And therefore ordainis all presentations to benefices, to be direct to the particular Presbyteries, in all time cumming : with full power to giue collation thereupon ; And to put ordour to all matters and causes Ecclesiasticall, within their boundes, according to the discipline of the Kirk : Providing the foresaid Presbyteries be bound and astricte, to receive and admit quhatsumeuer qualified Minister, presented be his Majestic, or laick patrones.

No. XLIII.

Proclamation by Charles I.

CHARLES by the grace of God, King of Scotland, England, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, To our Lovites
Heralds

Messengers, our Sherifffes in that part, conjunctly and severally specially constitute greeting. Forsameikle as We are not ignorant of the great disorders which have happened of late within this Our ancient Kingdome of Scotland, occasioned, as is pretended, upon the introduction of the *Service Book*, *Book of Canons*, and *High Commission*, thereby fearing innovation of Religion and Laws. For satisfaction of which fears, We well hoped, that the two Proclamations of the eleventh of December, and nineteenth of February, had been abundantly sufficient: Neverthelesse, finding that disorders have daily so increased, that a powerful rather than perswasive way, might have been justly expected from Us; Yet We out of Our innative indulgence to Our people, grieving to see them run themselves so headlong into ruine, are graciously pleased to try, if by a faire way We can reclaime them from their faults, rather than to let them perish in the same. And therefore once for all We have thought fit to declare, and hereby to assure all Our good people, that We neither were, are, nor by the Grace of God ever shall be stained with Popish superstition: But by the contrary, are resolved to maintain the true Protestant Christian Religion already profest within this Our ancient Kingdome. And for farther clearing of scruples, We do hereby assure all men, that we will neither now nor hereafter presse the practice of the foresaid Canons and Service Book, nor any thing of that nature, but in such a faire and legall way, as shall satisfie all Our loving subjects, that we neither intend innovation in Religion or Lawes. And to this effect have given order to discharge all *Acts of Council* made thereanent. And for the high Commiss-

sion, We shall so rectifie it with the help of advice of Our privie Councel, that it shall never impugne the Lawes, nor bee a just grievance to Our loyall subjects. And what is farder fitting to be agitate in generall Assemblies and Parliament, for the good and peace of the Kirk, and peaceable government of the same, in establishing of the Religion presently profest, shall likewise be taken into Our Royal consideration, in a free Assembly and Parliament, which shall be indicted and called with Our best convenience. And We hereby take God to witnessse, that Our true meaning and intention is, not to admit of any innovations either in Religion or Laws, but carefully to maintain the purity of Religion already profest and established, and no wayes to suffer Our Lawes to be infringed. And although We cannot be ignorant, that there may be some disaffected persons who will strive to possesse the hearts of Our good subjects, that this Our gracious declaration is not to be regarded; Yet We do expect that the behaviour of all Our good and loyall subjects will be such, as may give testimonie of their obedience, and how sensible they are of Our grace and favour, that thus passeth over their misdemeanours, and by their future carriage make appeare, that it was only feare of innovation, that hath caused the disorders which have happened of late within this Our ancient Kingdome. And are confident, that they will not suffer themselves to be seduced and mis-led, to misconstrue Us or Our actions, but rest heartily satisfied with Our pious and reall intentions, for maintenance of the true Religion and Lawes of this Kingdome. Wherefore We require and heartily wish all Our good people carefully to advert to these dangerous suggestions, and not to permit themselves, blindly under pretext of Religion, to be led in disobedience, and draw on infinitely, to Our grief, their own ruine, which We have, and still shall strive to save them from, so long as We see not royall Authority shaken off. And most unwillingly shall make use of that power which God hath endued Us with, for reclaiming of disobedient people.

Our Will is herefore, and Wee charge you straightly and command, that incontinent these Our Letters scene, you passe

to the market crosse of Our Burgh of Edinburgh, and all other places needfull, and there by open Proclamation make publication hereof to all and sundry Our good subjects, where through none pretend ignorance of the same. The which to do, We commit to you conjunctly and severally Our full power, by these Our Letters, delivering the same by you duely execute and indorsed againe to the Bearer. Given at Our Court of Greenwich the twenty eight day of June, and of Our Reigne the thirteenth year, 1638.

Per Regem.

No. XLIV.

Proclamation by Charles I. rescinding all Acts for establishing the Book of Canons, &c.

Charles, by the grace of God, King of Scotland, England, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith. To Our Lovites,

Messengers, Our Sheriffes, in that part conjunctly and severally specially constitute, greeting. Forsoomuch as the cause and occasion of all the distractions which have happened of late both in Church and Common-weale of this our Kingdome, have proceeded from the conceived feares of innovation of Religion and Lawes; To free all Our good subjects of the least suspicion of any intention in Us to innovate any thing, either in Religion or Lawes, and to satisfie not merely their desires, but even their doubts, *We have discharged, and by these presents do discharge the Service Booke, Booke of Canons, and High Commission, and the practice of them, or any of them; and by these presents annulls and rescinds all Acts of Councell, Proclamations, and other acts and deeds whatsoever, that have beeene made or published, for establishing them, or any of them, and declares the same to be null, and to have no force nor effect in time coming.* And being informed, that the urging of the practice of the five Articles of Perth Assem-

bly hath bred great distraction and division in the Church and State, We have beene graciously pleased to take the same into Our consideration; and for the quiet and peace of Church and State, doe not onely dispense with the practice of the saids Articles, but also discharge, like as by these presents We discharge all and whatsoever persons from urging the practice thereof, upon either Laick or Ecclesiasticall person whatsoever. And We doe hereby free all Our subjects from all censure and paine, whether ecclesiasticall or secular, for not urging, practising, or obeying the same, notwithstanding of any thing contained in the Acts of Parliament, or generall Assembly, to the contrary. And because it hath beene, to the disgrace of government, disperst and surmised throughout this Our Kingdome, that some of Our subjects have exercised such illimited and unwarranted power, and have held themselves eximed from censure and punishment, to which others Our subjects are lyable, We doe by these presents declare, that if any of Our subjects, whether ecclesiasticall or civill, of whatsoever qualitie, title, or degree, have, or shall at any time presume to doe any such act, or assume to themselves any such exemption or power, That they shall, like as by these presents We make and ordaine them to be lyable to the triall and censure of Parliament, generall Assembly, or any other Judicatories competent, according to the nature and qualitie of the offence. And for the free entry of Ministers, that no other oath be administrate unto them then that which is contained in the act of Parliament, And to give Our subjects full assurance, that We never intend to admit of any change or alteration in the true Religion alreadie established and professed into this Our Kingdome, And that all Our good people may be fully and clearly satisfied of the realitie of Our intentions towards the maintenance of the truth and integrarie of the said Religion, We have thought fit and expedient to enjoine and authorize, like as We by these presents doe require and command all the Lords of Our privie Councell, Senatours of the Colledge of Justice, Judges, and Magistrates to burgh and land, and all Our other subjects whatsoever, to subscribe and renew the Confession of Faith, subscribed at first by Our deare Father and His hounshold, in the

yeare of God 1580. Thereafter by persons of all rankes, in the yeere 1581. by ordinance of the Lords of secret Councell, and acts of the generall Assembly. Subscribed againe by all sorts of persons in the yeere 1590. by a new ordinance of Councell at the desire of the generall Assembly, with their general band of maintenance of the true Religion, and the Kings person. And for that effect We doe require the Lords of Councell to take such course anent the foresaid confession and generall band, that it may be subscribed and renewed throughout the whole kingdome with all possible diligence. And because we will not leave in Our subjects minds the least scruple or doubt of Our royall intentions and reall resolutions, We have given warrant to Our Commissioner to indict a free generall Assembly, to be holden at Glasgow the twenty first day of November, in this present yeare 1638. And thereafter a Parliament to be holden at Edinburgh the fifteenth day of May Anno 1639. for settling a perfect peace in the Church and Common-weale of this kingdome. And because it is likely that the disorders and distractions which have happened of late, have beene occasioned through the conceived feares of innovation of Religion and Lawes, and not out of any disloyaltie or disaffection to soveraigntie, We are graciously pleased absolutely to forget what is past, and freely to forgive all by-gones to all such as shall acquiesce to this Our gracius pleasure, and carry themselves peaceably as loyall and dutifull subjects, and shall ratifie and approve the same in Our next ensuing Parliament. And that this Assembly may have the better successe, and more happy conclusion, Our will is, that there be a solemne Fast proclaimed and kept by all Our good subjects of this kingdome, a foureteene dayes before the beginning of the said Assembly: the causes thereof to be a beggning a blessing from God upon that Assembly, and a peaceable end to the distractions of this Church and Kingdome, with the aversion of Gods heavie judgment from both. And Our pleasure is, that this Fast be kept in the most solemne manner as hath beene in this Church at any time heretofore upon the most extraordinary occasion.

Our will is herefore, and We charge you straightly and command, that incontinent these Our Letters seen, ye passe, and

make publication hereof by open proclamation at the market Crosses of the head burrowes of this kingdom, where-through none pretend ignorance of the same.

Given at Our Court of Oatlands, the ninth day of September, 1638.

Per Regem.

No. XLV.

Assembly at Glasgow, December 6, 1638. Sess. 14.

I. Act concerning the Service-Book, Book of Canons, Book of Ordination, and the High Commission.

I. The Assembly having diligently considered the Book of Common-prayer, lately obtruded upon the reformed Kirk within this Realm, both in respect of the Manner of the introducing thereof, and in respect of the Matter which it containeth, findeth, that it hath been devised, and brought in by the pretended Prelates, *without Direction from the Kirk*, and pressed upon Ministers *without Warrant from the Kirk*, to be universally received, as the only Form of Divine Service, under all highest Pains, both Civil and Ecclesiastical ; and the Book itself, beside the Popish Frame and Forms in Divine Worship, to contain many Popish Errors and Ceremonies, and the Seeds of manifold and gross Superstition and Idolatry. The Assembly, therefore, all in one Voice, hath rejected and condemned, and by these Presents doth reject and condemn the said Book, not only as illegally introduced, but also as repugnant to the Doctrine, Discipline, and Order of this reformed Kirk, to the Confession of Faith, Constitutions of General Assemblies, and Acts of Parliament establishing the true Religion ; and doth prohibite the Use and Practice thereof: And ordain Presbyteries to proceed with the Censure of the Kirk against all such as shall transgress.

II. The Assembly also, taking to their Consideration the Book of Canons, and the Manner how it hath been introduced, findeth, that it hath been devised by the pretended Prelates, *without Warrant or Direction from the General Assembly*; and to establish a tyrannical Power in the Persons of the pretended Bishops, over the Worship of God, Mens' Consciences, Liberties and Goods; and to overthrow the whole Discipline and Government of the General and Synodical Assemblies, Presbyteries, and Sessions, formerly established in our Kirk; Therefore the Assembly, all in one Voice, hath rejected and condemned, and by these Presents, doth reject and condemn the said Book, as contrair to the Confession of our Faith, and repugnant to the established Government, the Book of Discipline, and the Acts and Constitutions of our Kirk; prohibites the Use and Practice of the same; and ordains Presbyteries to proceed with the Censure of the Kirk, against all such as shall transgress.

No. XLVI.

Assembly at Edinburgh, Aug. 27, 1647, Sess. 23.

Act Approving the Confession of Faith.

A Confession of Faith for the Kirks of God, in the Three Kingdoms, being the chiefest Part of that Uniformity in Religion, which by the Solemn League and Covenant, we are bound to endeavour; and there being accordingly, a Confession of Faith agreed upon, by the Assembly of Divines sitting at Westminster, with the Assistance of Commissioners, from the Kirk of Scotland; Which Confession was sent from our Commissioners at London, to the Commissioners of the Kirk met at Edinburgh, in January last, and hath been in this Assembly twice publickly read over, examined and considered; Copies thereof being also printed, that it might be particularly perused

by all the Members of this Assembly, unto whom frequent Intimation was publickly made, to put in their Doubts and Objections, if they had any ; and the said Confession being, upon due Examination thereof, found by the Assembly, to be most agreeable to the Word of God, and in nothing contrary to the received Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Government of this Kirk ; And lastly, It being so necessary, and so much long'd for, that the said Confession be with all possible Diligence and Expedition, approved and established in both Kingdoms, as a principal Part of the intended Uniformity in Religion, and as a special Means for the more effectual suppressing of the many dangerous Errors and Heresies of these Times ; The General Assembly doth therefore, after mature Deliberation, agree unto, and approve the said Confession, as to the Truth of the Matter (judging it to be most Orthodox, and grounded upon the Word of God) and also, as to the Point of Uniformity, agreeing, for our Part, that it be a common Confession of Faith for the Three Kingdoms. The Assembly doth also bless the Lord, and thankfully acknowledge his great Mercy, in that so excellent a Confession of Faith is prepared, and thus far agreed upon in both Kingdoms, which we look upon, as a great strengthening of the true reformed Religion against the common Enemies thereof. But lest our Intention and Meaning be in some Particulars misunderstood, it is hereby expressly Declared and Provided, that the not mentioning in this Confession, the several Sorts of Ecclesiastical Officers and Assemblies, shall be no Prejudice to the Truth of Christ, in these Particulars, to be expressed fully in the Directory of Government. It is further Declared, That the Assembly understandeth some Parts of the second Article of the Thirty one Chapter, only of Kirks not settled, or constituted in Point of Government ; And that although, in such Kirks, a Synod of Ministers, and other fit Persons, may be called by the Magistrates Authority and Nomination, without any other Call, to consult and advise with, about Matters of Religion ; and although likewise, the Ministers of Christ, without Delegation from their Churches, may of themselves, and by Virtue of their Office, meet together synodically in such Kirks, not yet

constituted ; yet neither of these ought to be done, in Kirks constituted and settled : It being always free to the Magistrate to advise with Synods of Ministers and Ruling Elders, meeting upon Delegation from their Churches, either ordinarily, or being indicted by his Authority, occasionally and *pro re nata* ; it being also free to assemble together synodically, as well *pro re nata*, as at the ordinary Times, upon Delegation from the Churches, by the intrinsical Power received from Christ, as often as it is necessary for the Good of the Church, so to assemble, in case the Magistrate, to the Detriment of the Church, withhold or deny his Consent, the Necessity of occasional Assemblies being first remonstrate unto him, by humble Supplication.

No. XLVII.

The CONFESSION of FAITH, agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, examined and approved, Anno 1647, by the Church of Scotland. And ratified by Act of Parliament 1690.

CHAP. I.

Of the Holy Scripture.

VIII. THE Old Testament in Hebrew (which was the Native Language of the People of God of old) and the New Testament in Greek, (which at the time of the Writing of it was most generally known to the Nations) being immediately inspired by God, and by his singular Care and Providence kept pure in all Ages, are therefore Authentical ; so as, in all Controversies of Religion, the Church is finally to appeal unto them. But, because these original Tongues are not known to all the People of God, who have right unto, and Interest in the Scriptures,

and are commanded, in the Fear of God, to read and search them ; therefore they are to be translated into the vulgar Language of every Nation unto which they come, that the Word of God dwelling plentifully in all, they may worship him in an acceptable manner ; and through Patience and Comfort of the Scriptures, may have Hope.

IX. The infallible Rule of Interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself ; and therefore, when there is a Question about the true and full sense of any Scripture (which is not manifold, but one) it must be searched and known by other Places that speak more clearly.

X. The Supreme Judge, [by which all Controversies of Religion are to be determined, and all Decrees of Councils, Opinions of ancient Writers, Doctrines of Men, and private Spirits, are to be examined ; and, in whose Sentence we are to rest ; can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture.

No. XLVIII.

CHAP. XXIII. *Of the Civil Magistrate.*

GOD, the supreme Lord and King of all the World, hath ordained Civil Magistrates, to be under him, over the People for his own glory, and the Publick Good : and, to this end, hath armed them with the Power of the Sword, for the Defence and Encouragement of them that are Good, and for the Punishment of Evil-doers.

II. It is lawful for Christians to accept and execute the Office of a Magistrate, when called thereunto ; in the managing whereof, as they ought especially to maintain Piety, Justice, and Peace, according to the wholsom Laws of each Common-wealth : So, for that End, they may lawfully, now under the New Testament, wage War, upon just and necessary Occasions.

III. The Civil Magistrate may not assume to himself the Administration of the Word and Sacraments, or the Power of the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven: Yet, he hath Authority, and it is his Duty, to take Order, that Unity and Peace be preserved in the Church, that the Truth of God be kept pure and entire, that all Blasphemies and Heresies be suppressed, all corruptions and Abuses in Worship and Discipline prevented, or reformed, and all the Ordinances of God duly settled, administred, and observed. For the better effecting whereof, he hath Power to call Synods, to be present at them, and to provide that whatsoever is transacted in them, be according to the Mind of God.

IV. It is the Duty of People to pray for Magistrates, to honour their Persons, to pay them Tribute and other Dues, to obey their lawful Commands, and to be subject to their authority, for Conscience sake. Infidelity, or Difference in Religion, doth not make void the Magistrate's just and legal Authority, nor free the People from their due Obedience to him: From which, Ecclesiastical Persons are not exempted; much less hath the Pope any Power or Jurisdiction over them, in their Dominions, or over any of their People; and least of all, to deprive them of their Dominions, or Lives, if he shall judge them to be Hereticks, or upon any other pretence whatsoever.

CHAP. XXV. *Of the Church.*

VI. There is no other Head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ: Nor can the Pope of Rome, in any Sense, be Head thereof; but is that Antichrist, that Man of Sin, and Son of Perdition, that exalteth himself in the Church, against Christ, and all that is called God.

CHAP. XXX. *Of Church Censures.*

THE Lord Jesus, as King and Head of his Church, hath therein appointed a Government, in the Hand of Church-Officers, distinct from the Civil Magistrate.

CHAP. XXXI. *Of Synods and Councils.*

FOR the better Government, and further Edification of the Church, there ought to be such Assemblies, as are commonly called Synods or Councils.

II. As Magistrates may lawfully call a Synod of Ministers, and other fit Persons, to consult and advise with, about Matters of Religion ; so, if Magistrates be open Enemies to the Church, the Ministers of Christ, of themselves, by virtue of their Office ; or they, with other fit Persons, upon Delegation from their Churches, may meet together in such Assemblies.

III. It belongeth to Synods and Councils, ministerially to determine Controversies of Faith, and Cases of Conscience ; to set down Rules and Directions for the better ordering of the public Worship of God, and Government of his Church ; to receive Complaints in Cases of Male-administration, and authoritatively to determine the same : Which Decrees and Determinations, if consonant to the Word of God, are to be received with Reverence and Submission ; not only for their Agreement with the Word, but also for the Power whereby they are made, as being an Ordinance of God appointed thereunto in his Word.

IV. All Synods and Councils, since the Apostles Times, whether general or particular, may err, and many have erred : Therefore, they are not to be made the Rule of Faith or Practice, but to be used as an Help in both.

V. Synods and Councils are to handle or conclude nothing, but that which is Ecclesiastical ; and are not to intermeddle with Civil Affairs, which concern the Common-wealth, unless by Way of humble Petition, in Cases extraordinary, or by Way of Advice, for Satisfaction of Conscience, if they be thereunto required by the Civil Magistrate.

No. XLIX.

An Act made in the first Parliament of K. William and Q. Mary.

Act. III. Abolishing Prelacy, 22d July 1689.

WHEREAS the Estates of this Kingdom, in their Claim of Right of the eleventh of April last, declared that Prelacy, and the Superiority of any Office in the Church above Presbyters, is and hath been a great and insupportable grievance to this nation, and contrary to the Inclinations of the Generality of the people ever since the Reformation, they having reformed from Popery by Presbyters, and therefore ought to be abolished, our Sovereign Lord and Lady, the King and Queen's Majesties, with Advice and Consent of the Estates of Parliament, do hereby abolish Prelacy, and all Superiority of any Office in the Church in this Kingdom above Presbyters, and hereby rescinds, casses and annulls the first Act of the second Session of the first Parl. of K. Charles II. and the second Act of the third Sess. of the first Parl. of K. Charles II. and the fourth Act of the third Parl. of K. Charles II. and all other Acts, Statutes and Constitutions, in so far allanerly as they are inconsistent with this Act, and do establish Prelacy, or the Superiority of Church-Officers above Presbyters : And the King and Queen's Majesties do declare, that they, with Advice and Consent of the Estates of this Parliament, will settle by Law that *Church*

Government in this Kingdom, which is most agreeable to the Inclinations of the People.

No. L.

Acts made Sess. 2. Parl. 1. K. William and Q. Mary.

Act I.—Rescinding the first Act of the second Parliament, 1669.

25th April 1690.

Our Sovereign Lord and Lady, the King and Queen's Majesties, taking into their Consideration, that, by the second Article of the Grievances presented to their Majesties by the Estates of this Kingdom, it is declared, That the first Act of the second Parliament of K. Charles II. intitled, Act asserting his Majesty's Supremacy over all Persons, and in all Causes ecclesiastical, is inconsistent with the Establishment of the Church Government now desired, and ought to be abrogat, therefore their Majesties, with Advice and consent of the Estates of Parliament, do hereby abrogat, rescind and annul the foresaid Act, and declares the same, in the whole Heads, Articles and Clauses thereof, to be of no Force or Effect in all Time coming.

No. LI.

William and Mary, Parl. 1. Sess. 2.

Act V. Ratifying the Confession of Faith, and settling Presbyterian Church Government. 7th June 1690.

Our Sovereign Lord and Lady, the King and Queen's Majesties, and three estates of Parliament, conceiving it to be

their bound Duty, after the great Deliverance that God hath lately wrought for this Church and Kingdom, in the first Place to settle and secure therein the true Protestant Religion according to the Truth of God's Word, as it hath of a long Time been professed within this Land ; as also the Government of Christ's Church within this nation, agreeable to the Word of God, and most conducive to the Advancement of true Piety and Godliness, and the establishing of Peace and Tranquillity within this Realm ; and that by an Article of the Claim of Right it is declared, That Prelacy, and the Superiority of any Office in the Church above Presbyters, is and hath been a great and unsupportable Grievance and Trouble to this Nation, and contrary to the Inclinations of the Generality of the People ever since the Reformation, they having reformed from Popery by Presbyters, and therefore ought to be abolished ; Likeas, by an Act of the last Session of this Parliament, Prelacy is abolished ; Therefore their Majesties, with Advice and Consent of the said three Estates, do hereby revive, ratify and perpetually confirm all Laws, Statutes and Acts of Parliament made against Popery and Papists, and for the Maintenance and Preservation of the true reformed Protestant Religion, and for the true Church of Christ within this Kingdom, in so far as they confirm the same, or are made in favours thereof : Likeas they, by these Presents, ratify and establish the Confession of Faith now read in their Presence, and voted and approven by them as the public and avowed Confession of this Church, containing the Sum and Substance of the Doctrine of the reformed Churches, (which Confession of Faith is subjoined to this present Act) as also they do establish, ratify and confirm the *Presbyterian Church Government and Discipline* ; that is to say, the *Government of the Church by Kirk-Sessions, Presbyteries, Provincial Synods and General Assemblies*, ratified and established by the 114 Act, Ja. VI. Parl. 12. anno 1592, entitled, *Ratification of the Liberty of the true Kirk, &c. and thereafter received, by the general Consent of this nation, to be the only Government of Christ's Church within this kingdom* ; reviving, renewing and confirming the foresaid Act of Parliament in the whole Heads thereof, except that Part of it relating to Patronages, which is

hereafter to be taken into Consideration ; and rescinding, annulling, and making void the Acts of Parliament following, viz. Act anent Restitution of Bishops, Ja. VI. Parl. 18. Cap. 2. Act ratifying the Acts of the Assembly 1610. Ja. VI. Parl. 21. Cap. 1. Act anent the Election of Archbishops and Bishops, Ja. VI. Parl. 22. Cap. 1. Act intitled, Ratification of the five Articles of the General Assembly at Perth, Ja. VI. Parl. 23. Cap. 1. Act intitled, For the Restitution and Re-establishment of the antient Government of the Church by Archbishops and Bishops, Char. II. Parl. 1. Sess. 2. Act 1. Anent the Constitution of a National Synod, Char. II. Parl. 1. Sess. 3. Act 5. Act against such as refuse to depone against Delinquents, Char. II. Parl. 2. Sess. 2. Act 2. Act intitled, Act acknowledging and asserting the Right of Succession to the Imperial Crown of Scotland, Charl. II. Parl. 3. Act 2. Act intitled, Act anent Religion and the Test, Char. II. Parl. 3. Act 6. with all other Acts, Laws, Statutes, Ordinances and Proclamations, and that in so far alienarly as the saids Acts, and others generally and particularly above mentioned, are contrary or prejudicial to, inconsistent with or derogatory from the Protestant Religion, and Presbyterian Government now established ; and allowing and declaring, that the Church Government be established in the Hands of, and exercised by these Presbyterian Ministers who were outed since the first of January 1661. for Non-Conformity to Prelacy, or not complying with the Courses of the Times, and are now restored by the late Act of Parliament, and such Ministers and Elders only as they have admitted or received, or shall hereafter admit or receive ; and also, that all the said Presbyterian Ministers have, and shall have right to the Maintenance, Rights, and other Privileges by Law provided to the Ministers of Christ's Church within this Kingdom, as they are or shall be legally admitted to particular Churches : Likeas, in Pursuance of the Premisses, their Majesties do hereby appoint the first Meeting of the General Assembly of this Church, as above established, to be at Edinburgh the third Thursday of October next to come, in this instant Year 1690. And because many conform Ministers either have deserted, or were removed from Preaching in their Churches, preceding the 13th Day of

April 1689, and others were deprived for not giving Obedience to the Act of the Estates, made in the said 13th of April 1689, intitled, Proclamation against the owning the late King James, and appointing publick Prayers for King William and Queen Mary, therefore their Majesties, with Advice and Consent foresaid, do hereby declare all the Churches, either deserted, or from which the conform Ministers were removed or deprived, as said is, to be vacant, and that the Presbyterian Ministers exercising their Ministry within any of these Parishes, (or where the last Incumbent is dead) by the Desire or Consent of the Parish, shall continue their Possession, and have Right to the Benefices and Stipends according to their Entry in the Year 1689, and in Time coming, ay and while the Church, as now established, take farther Course therewith: And to the Effect the Disorders that have happened in this Church may be redressed, their Majesties, with Advice and Consent foresaid, do hereby allow the general Meeting, and Representatives of the foresaid Presbyterian Ministers and Elders, in whose Hands the Exercise of the Church Government is established, either by themselves, or by such Ministers and Elders as shall be appointed and authorized Visitors by them, according to the Custom and Practice of Presbyterian Government throughout the whole Kingdom, and several Parts thereof, to try and purge out all insufficient, negligent, scandalous and erroneous Ministers, by due Course of ecclesiastical Process and Censures, and likeways for redressing all other Church Disorders: And further, it is hereby provided, that whatsoever Minister, being conveened before the said General Meeting, and Representatives of the Presbyterian Ministers and Elders, or the Visitors to be appointed by them, shall either prove contumacious in not appearing, or be found guilty, and shall be therefore censured, whether by Suspension or Deposition, they shall *ipso facto* be suspended from, or deprived of their Stipends and Benefices.

No. LII.

Act XXII. For settling the Quiet and Peace of the Church. 12th June 1693.

Our Sovereign Lord and Lady, the King and Queens Majesties, with Advice and Consent of the Estates of Parliament, ratify, approve, and perpetually confirm the 5th Act of the 2d Session of this current Parliament, intituled, Act ratifying the Confession of Faith, and settling Presbyterian Church Government, in the whole Heads, Articles and Clauses thereof; and do further statute and ordain, that no Person be admitted, or continued for hereafter, to be a Minister or Preacher within this Church, unless that he, having first taken and subscribed the Oath of Allegiance, and subscribed the Assurance in Manner appointed by another Act of this present Session of Parliament, made thereanent, do also subscribe the Confession of Faith, ratified in the foresaid 5th Act of the second Session of this Parliament, declaring the same to be the Confession of his Faith, and that he owns the Doctrine therein contained, to be the true Doctrine which he will constantly adhere to; as likewise, that he owns and acknowledges Presbyterian Church Government, as settled by the foresaid 5th Act of the 2d Session of this Parliament, to be the only Government of this Church, and that he will submit thereto, and concur therewith, and never endeavour, directly or indirectly, the Prejudice or Subversion thereof: And their Majesties, with Advice and Consent foresaid, statute and ordain, that uniformity of Worship, and of the Administration of all public Ordinances, within this Church, be observed by all the said Ministers and Preachers, *as the samen are at present performed and allowed therein, or shall be hereafter declared by the Authority of the same;* and that no Minister or Preacher be admitted or continued for hereafter, unless that he subscribe to observe, and do actually observe the foresaid Uniformity.

No. LIII.

An Act made Sess. 4. Parl. 1. Q. Anne, begun 3d October 1706.

Act VI. For securing the Protestant Religion and Presbyterian Church Government.

OUR Sovereign Lady and the Estates of Parliament, considering that, by the late Act of Parliament for a Treaty with England for an Union of both Kingdoms, it is provided, That the Commissioners for the Treaty should not treat of or concerning any Alteration of the Worship, Discipline and Government of the Church of that Kingdom, as now by Law established; which Treaty, being now reported to the Parliament, and being reasonable and necessary that the true Protestant Religion, as presently professed within this Kingdom, with the Worship, Discipline and Government of this Church, should be effectually and unalterably secured, therefore her Majesty, with Advice and Consent of the said Estates of Parliament, doth hereby establish and confirm the said true Protestant Religion, and the Worship, Discipline and Government of this Church, to continue without any Alteration to the People of this Land in all succeeding Generations; and more especially her Majesty, with Advice and Consent aforesaid, ratifies, approves, and for ever confirms the fifth Act of the first Parliament of K. William and Q. Mary, intitled, *Act ratifying the Confession of Faith, and settling Presbyterian Church Government, with the haill other Acts of Parliament relating thereto, in Prosecution of the Declaration of the Estates of the Kingdom, containing the Claim of Right*, bearing Date the eleventh of April 1589. And her Majesty, with Advice and Consent aforesaid, expressly provides and declares, that the foresaid true Protestant Religion, contained in the above mentioned Confession of Faith, with the Form and Purity of Worship presently in

Use within this Church, and its Presbyterian Church Government and Discipline, that is to say, the Government of the Church by Kirk-Sessions, Presbyteries, Provincial Synods and General Assemblies, all established by the foresaid Acts of Parliament, pursuant to the Claim of Right, shall remain and continue unalterable, and that *the said Presbyterian Government shall be the only Government of the Church within the Kingdom of Scotland*: And farther, for the greater Security of the foresaid Protestant Religion, and of the Worship, Discipline and Government of this Church, as above established, her Majesty, with Advice and Consent foresaid, statutes and ordains, that the Universities and Colleges of St Andrews, Glasgow, Aberdeen, and Edinburgh, as now established by Law, shall continue within this Kingdom for ever, and that, in all Time coming, no Professors, Principals, Regents, Masters, and others bearing Office in any University, College or School within this Kingdom, be capable, or be admitted or allowed to continue in the Exercise of their said Functions, but such as shall own and acknowledge the civil Government, in Manner prescribed, or to be prescribed by the Acts of Parliament; as also that, before or at their Admissions, they do and shall acknowledge and profess, and shall subscribe to the foresaid Confession of Faith, as the Confession of their Faith, and that they will practise and conform themselves to the Worship presently in use in this Church, and submit themselves to the Government and discipline thereof, and never endeavour, directly or indirectly, the Prejudice or subversion of the same, and that before the respective Presbyteries of their Bounds, by whatsoever Gift, Presentation or Provision they may be thereto provided. And farther, her Majesty, with Advice foresaid, expressly declares and statutes, that none of the Subjects of this Kingdom shall be liable to, but, all and every one of them, for ever free of any Oath, Test or Subscription within this Kingdom, contrary to or inconsistent with the foresaid true Protestant Religion, and Presbyterian Church-Government, Worship and Discipline, as above established, and that the same, within the Bounds of this Church and Kingdom, shall never be im-

posed upon or required of them in any sort ; and, lastly, that after the Decease of her present Majesty (whom God long preserve) the Sovereign succeeding to her in the Royal Government of the Kingdom of Great Britain, shall, in all Time coming, at his or her Accession to the Crown, *swear and subscribe*, that they shall inviolably maintain and preserve the foresaid Settlement of the true Protestant Religion, *with the Government, Discipline, Worship, Rights and Privileges of this Church*, as above established by the Laws of this Kingdom, *in Prosecution of the Claim of Right*. And it is hereby statute and ordained, that this Act of Parliament, with the Establishment therein contained, shall be held and observed, in all time coming, as a fundamental and essential Condition of any Treaty or Union to be concluded betwixt the two Kingdoms, without any Alteration thereof, or Derogation thereto in any Sort for ever ; as also that this Act of Parliament, and Settlement therein contained, shall be insert and repeated in any Act of Parliament that shall pass for agreeing and concluding the foresaid Treaty or Union betwixt the two Kingdoms, and that the same shall be therein expressly declared to be a fundamental and essential Condition of the said Treaty or Union in all Time coming.

No. LIV.

Parl. 1. William & Mary, Sess. 2.

Act XXVII. Rescinding the Laws for Conformity.

19th July 1690.

OUR Sovereign Lord and Lady, the King and Queens Majesties, and three Estates of Parliament, considering how necessary it is for the Well and Peace of this Kingdom, and of Christ's Church, within the same, as now by Law established, that the Acts following be rescinded, do therefore rescind, cass, annull and make void the Act Charl. 2. Parl. 1. Sess. 2. Cap. 4. concerning Masters of Universities, Ministers, &c. Act 5. *ibidem*, concerning the Declaration to be signed by all Persons in publick Trust. Act Charl. 2. Parl. 1. Sess. 3. Cap. 2. against Separation and Disobedience to ecclesiastick Authority. Act, Cap. 3. *ibidem*, additional Act concerning the Declaration. Act, Charl. 2. Parl. 2. Sess. 2. Cap. 5. against Conventicles. Act, Cap. 6. *ibidem*, against disorderly Baptisms. Act, Cap. 7. *ibidem*, against Separation and withdrawing from the publick Meetings of divine Worship. Act, Charl. 2. Parl. 2. Sess. 3. Cap. 9. against unlawful Ordinations. Act, Charl. 2. Parl. 2. Sess. 3. Cap. 17. against Keepers of Conventicles, and Withdrawers from publick Worship. Act, Charl. 2. Parl. 3. Cap. 4: for securing of the Peace of the Country. Act, James 7. Parl. 1. Sess. 1. Cap. 6. obliging Husbands to be liable for their Wives Fines. Act, Cap. 8. *ibidem*, against Preachers at Conventicles, and Hearers at Field Conventicles. Act, Cap. 24. *ibidem*, ordaining that Tenants be obliged by their Tacks to live regularly. And generally all other Acts, Clauses, and Provisions in Acts whatsoever, made since the year 1661, *inclusive*, against Non-conformity, or for Conformity to the Church and Government thereof, as then established under Archbishops and Bishops.

No. LV.

Parl. 1. William & Mary, Sess. 2.
Act XXVIII. Rescinding several Acts of Parliament.
19th July 1690.

OUR Sovereign Lord and Lady, the King and Queens Majesties, and three Estates of Parliament, considering that, during these late Years bypast, several Acts of Parliament have been made, which are now either useless, or found to be hurtful, do therefore rescind, cass, annull and make void, in all time coming, the Acts of Parliament following, viz, Act, Charl. 2. Parl. 1. Sess. 1. Cap. 17. anent a solemn Anniversary Thanksgiving, with the Act, Charl. 2. Parl. 2. Sess. 3. Cap. 12. to the same Purpose. Act, Charl. 2. Cap. 25. for denouncing excommunicate Persons. And, Parl. 1. Sess. 3. Cap. 23. anent Sentences of Excommunication, with all other Acts of the same Import; and but Prejudice of this Generality, all Acts enjoining Civil Pains upon Sentences of Excommunication. Act, Charl. 2. Parl. 3. Cap. 6. anent Religion and the Test. Act, Cap. 18. *ibidem*, affecting his Majesty's Prerogative in Point of Jurisdiction, with the Acts following, made during the reign of the late King James, viz. In the first Session of his first Parliament, Act 2. except in so far as concerns the Annexion of the Excise to the Crown. Acts 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 16, 17, 23, 25, 26, 27, 30, 36, 37, 40 and 42, all past in that Session of Parliament. As likeways in the second session of that Parliament, Acts 1, 6, 7, 9, 13, 26, 27, 28, all passed in that Parliament, with an unprinted Act also past therein, rescinding a former Act annexing the Lands and Barony of *Tarbet* to the Shire of *Cromarty*: declaring likeas their Majesties, with consent foresaid, hereby declares the whole foresaid Acts hereby above rescinded, to be of no Avail, Force, Strength nor Effect, in Time coming.

No. LVI.

Brown and Mosman his Majesty's Printers, against Baskett of London his Majesty's Printer.

July 15, 1725.

Mr. Robert Freebairn having in *August 1711* obtained a grant from her late Majesty Queen *Anne* to be sole Master-Printer in *Scotland* for the space of forty one Years, with an exclusive Privilege to him, his Partners, his Heirs, Assigns and Substitutes, during the foresaid Space, of printing Bibles, &c. In the month of *November* following he conveyed a Third of his Privilege to Mr. *Baskett*, and in *April* thereafter he made over another Third of it in favours of *James Watson*, in implement of Articles of Agreement entered into by the Parties previous to the Grant.

The Business of Printing was immediately thereafter begun and carried on by Mr. *Watson* alone, with good Success, though at great Expence, and at present is managed by Messrs. *Brown* and *Mosman*, as Assignies to Mr. *Watson's* Right; but Mr *Baskett* never implemented any of the Articles upon his Part, nor meddled in the Affair, till of late that he set up a separate Printing-house in *Edinburgh*, to the prejudice of *Brown* and *Mosman*: And therefore they brought an Action against Mr. *Baskett* for stopping his Work; and the first Point they insisted upon was, "That *Baskett* never had accepted the Gift " and could not now pretend to make any Use of it, not having taken the Oaths, particularly the Oath of *Abjuration*, " within the Time limited by Statute." For by an Act of the sixth of Queen *Anne*, entituled, *An Act for the better Security of her Majesty's Person and Government*, it is enacted, *That all Officers Civil and Military within Scotland be obliged to take the Oath of ABJURATION.*

In answer to this, Mr. *Baskett* contended, 1mo, That no Person was obliged by the Act *sexti Anæ* to take the *Abjura-*

tion, but he who was by the Act 1693 obliged to take the Oaths of Allegiance and Assurance. And 2do, That the Office of King's Printer was no such Civil Office as, by the Intention of the Statute, could subject Mr. Baskett to take the Oath of Abjuration.

The Lords found, That the King's Printer was not obliged to take the Oaths.

EDGAR'S Decisions of the Court of Session.

No. LVII.

Act anent ane incorrect New Testament.

Apud Edinburgh duodecimo die January 1671.

The Lordis of Councill being informed that there is a New Testament printed by Andro Andersone printer in Edinburgh full of gross erroris, As lykwayes that there is a seditious pamphlett called *Jus populi vindicatum* latly cum furth in print Doe therefore Appoynyt the Archbishop of St Andrewes the Earls of Argyle and Kincardin and the Lord Advocat to call for the said new testament and the printer thereoff and to examine the said matter As also to inquyre after the forsaide pamphlett and the wrytter importaris or disperseris of the same And to seize upon any copyes of the saidis bookis can be found and to imprison any person guilty of printing importing or dispersing thereoff, And after considering and examining the said matter To report their opinion thereanent to the Councill.

No. LVIII.

Act anent ane incorrect New Testament.

Apud Edinburgh nono die February 1671.

The Lords of his Majesties privy Councill haveing considered the great danger may ensue to the christian religion from incorrect copyes of the booke containing the holy scriptures and that of late the new testament hath bein printed at Edinburgh in a black letter by Andro Anderson printer for the use of childrein at schooles with many grosse errouris and faultes in the impression doe therefor prohibit and discharge all the Stationeris and otheris of this kingdome to vent and putt to sale any of the copyes of that edition of the new testament untill the same be first amended and a title page prefixed thereto And doe ordaine and command the printer therof to reteir from the stationeris all the copyes of the same remaining with them unsold, and before they be offered againe to sale To correct and amend the errouris of the same and to prefix a new title page thereto bearing that this edition is corrected and amended in the year 1671 and that under the payne of payment of one hundred poundis sterlind in case he faylie herein As also the saidis Lordis doe prohibit and discharge any of the printeris of this kingdome to publish the booke of the old and new testament or any paire thereof Except the same be first carefully revised, and the errouris and escapes in the impression if any be amended Certifieing any who shall doe in the contrar that they shall not only forfault the benefite of the copyes of that impression with their libertie and privilege of printing for the future, Bot shall be farder censured and punisched as the Lords of councill shall think fitting And ordaines a macer or messinger at arms to make intimation hereof to the printeris bookselleris and other persons concerned that none may pretend ignorance.

No. LIX.

Anent the techeing of ane form of grammar.

Apud Haliruidhous xv Decembris, Anno 1575.

My Lord regentis grace and Lordis of secret counsall Understanding that it is convenient and proffitable for the upbring- ing of the yowth within this realme that thair be onlie ane form of grammar techeit in all the grammer scuillis thairof And to the effect that the same may be aggreit be commoun consent of certane of the maist leirnit scole maisteris Ordanis letteris to be direct To charge Maister George Buchannane or Maister Peter Young preceptouris to the Kingis Majestie Maister Thomas Buchannane Maister Williame Robertoun Maister Andro Symsoun Maister James Carmichaell Maister Patrik Auchinlek scole maisteris of Striveling Edinburgh Dunbar Hadingtoun and Sanctandrois To compeir personallie befoir the Regentis grace and Lords of secret counsale At Haliruidhous or quhair it sal happen thame to be for the tyme the tent day of Januar nixt to cum To gif thair advise anent the forme of grammer that sal be techeit in all the scuillis within this realme in time cuming As thay will declair thair gude affectionis to the furtherance of sa necessar a werk and ansuer upoun thair obedience in that behalf.

No. LX.

Apud Haliruidhous xj January anno 1576.

ANENT the complaint maid to my Lord Regentis grace and Lordis of secreit counsall be Alexander Arbuthnott burges of

Edinburgh Makand mentioun That quhair thair is ane contract maid betwix him and Thomas Bassinden buke binder Conten- and in effect that he sould deliver to the said Alexander with all possible diligence the werk of the bybill ellis prentit with the prenting hous and necessaris appertening thereto meit for setting furthwart of the said werk As the said contract at mair length beris Notwithstanding he on nawayis will do the samyn without he be compellit quhairthrow the said werk lyis ydill in the meintyme to the greit hurt of the commoun weill of this realme And anent the charge gevin to the said Thomas to compeir befoir my Lord regentis grace and Lordis of secreit counsall at ane certaine day bipast To answer to the said complaint under the pane of rebellion and putting of him to the horne as the samyn complaint at mair length beris The said Alexander Arbuthnet compearand personallie and the said Thomas Bassinden being alsua personalie present with Maister Richert Spens his prelocutour Thair ressonis and allegationis with the said contract being hard sene and consideret be my Lord Regentis grace and lordis of secreit counsale and thay rypelie avisit thairwith My Lord Regentis grace with avise of the saidis Lordis Ordanis the said Thomas to deliver to the said Alexander the said werk of the bybill ellis prentit with the prenting hous and necessaris appertaining thairto meit for setting furthwart of the said werk conforme to the said contract betuix the dait heirof and the last day of Januar instant. And ordanis letteris to be direct heirupon gif neid be.

No. LXI.

*Anno 1665.—For y^e bettering of y^e Inglish translation of
y^e Bible, (1st printed A. D. 1612,) by Mr. Jn^o. Row,
'tis offer'd.*

That these five things are to be endeavoured:

I. That 'evil and unmeet divisions of chapt^{rs}, verses, & sen-

tences, be rectify'd, & made more proper, rationall, & dexterous ; w^{ch} will much cleare y^e scope.

II. That needles transpositions of words, or stories, p^tending to Hypall or Synchyses, be waryly amended ; or noted if they cannot

III. That all vseles additions be lop't off, y^t debase the wisdome of y^e spirit ;—to instance

1. All y^e Apocryphall writings ; being meerly humane.
2. All popish & superstitious prints, plates, & pictures.
3. Apotheosing, and canonizing of some, (not oth^{rs}) as Sts. St Luke: not St Job
4. Spurious additions, or subscriptions, (to Epistles) words & Sentences.

IV. That all sinfull & needles detractions be supply'd; and y^t lies in 6 things, viz.

1. Let all Sentences, or words detracted, be added in y^e text.
2. Epitomize y^e contents, & chapt^{rs} better at y^e topps of y^e leafe.
3. The parenthesis ought not to be omitted, where 'tis.
4. Exhaust not the Emphasis of a word, (as Idols, 13 wayes exprest.)
5. Nor y^e Superlative, left only as a positive.
6. Notificatum, not noticed at all.

V. As respecting mutation, or change, 4 things are needfull ; namely,

1. That nothing be changed, but convinc't apparently, to be bettr :
2. Yet a change not hurting truth, piety, or ye text, may be just & needfull.
3. Many evil changes are to be amended, as these 9 in particular:
 - (1.) When words or sentences, are mistaken.
 - (2.) When ye margin is righter then y^e line, as in 800 places (& more) it is.
 - (3.) When particles are confounded.
 - (4.) When a word plurall, is translated as singular.
 - (5.) When the active is rendered as if a passive.

- (6.) When the genders are confounded: as mostly y^e cantic: bee.
- (7.) When Hebrismes are omitted, in silence, or amisse.
- (8.) When participium païil, is rendred as if it were Nyphall.
- (9.) When conjugatio pyël is Inglish't as if Kal.

4. (On the other hand) 9 good changes are to be warily endeavour'd, viz.

- (1.) Put y^e titles of y^e true god (all ouer) literâ Capituli.
- (2.) Let Majistrates correct misprinting of Bibles.
- (3.) Put more in Inglish, (even *propria nomina* :) less in Heb. Gr. & Latin termes.
- (4.) That Ingl. words (not understood in Scotland) be idiomatiz'd.
- (5.) That all be Analogicall to Scripture termes, not toucht wth our opinion, or error.
- (6.) Something Equivocal to Keri, & Kethib, be noticed.
- (7.) That letters, poynts, and stopps, be distinctly notified.
- (8.) The paralel places ought to be well noted, in the margin.
- (9.) Things not amiss, may be endeavored to be bettered.

The like is (as to y^e N. T.) to be endeavored, many words wanting their owne native idiom and import, and sometime y^e translation overflowes in y^e Inglish; or els is defective: and some words confounded: (Ex: gr: *δύναμις*, power, and *εξουσία*, in 70 or near 80 places translated *power* w^{ch} is properly *authority*, &c.

All this has been essayed by divers able Hebritians: as M^r H: J: M^r Jⁿ C. &c. whose notes, and pains are yet conceal'd, in private hands, but may come to light, and publick use, in due time.

No. LXII.

Act for allowing the Reading of the Scriptures in the Vulgar Tongue. 1542-3.

THE act for reading the Bible in English was first printed at length in the Preface to the "Letters and Negotiations of Sir Ralph Sadler, Edinburgh, for James M'Ewen and George Stewart, Bookseller, 1720." The editor refers to the Records of the Parliament James V. and Queen Mary, fol. 79. In Sadler's first letter, he states, that in Scotland "the Gospel is now set forth in English, and open proclamation made that it shall be lafull to all men to read the Bible and Testament in the mother tongue," &c. (p. 87.) Sadler, on the 1st of April, 1543, writing to the Privy Council of England stated, that "the Governor desired him to write into England for some books of the New Testament, and Bibles in English, &c. And (he adds) if it may please your Lordships, to take order for the accomplishment of his desire in that part, surely it will be very acceptable unto him." In his letter to Henry VIII. April 9, 1543, (p. 147.) he says, "Concerning the special points, which your Majesty's pleasure is I should communicate with the Governor here, in such sort as is expressed in your Highness said letters: In the first point, I find him in such terms as your Majesty would have him, for the setting forth of the Scripture; wherein he saith, he hath taken such direction for the admonishing of his people to read it sincerely and quietly to themselves for their own knowledge, without taking on them any sinister or rash interpretation of the same, as by the act of parliament made here in that behalf, he told me, is fully set forth, with the banishment of all other English books, saving the mere Scripture, being also of the best and truest translation. (See pages 83 and 128 of the quarto edition.)

The act allowing the reading of the Bible was next published by Crawfurd in the Appendix to the Lives of the Officers of

the Crown, Edinburgh, 1726. He describes the document as being “copied out of the Registers of Parliament in the public archives at Edinburgh.”

The Act, Protest, and Proclamation were also printed by Keith in his History of Scotland, 1734.

The Act and Protest, published in the recent edition of Acts of Parliament, have been transcribed from originals in the possession of the Duke of Hamilton.

No. LXIII.

From Calderwood's MS. History, vol. i. p. 814.

“Nothing to be printed in religion till revised by the superintendent.”

In the General Assembly at Sanct Johnstone, June 25, 1563, Sess. 3.

“It was ordained that no work should be set furth in print, or published in writh, touching religion or doctrine, before it be presented to the superintendent of the diocese, revised and approved by him, and such as he shall call of the most learned within his bounds. And if they, or any of them, doubt in any point, so that they cannot resolve clearly in the same, they shall produce the said work to the General Assembly, where order shall be taken for resolution of the said doubt.”

From Calderwood's MS. History, vol. ii. p. 65.

General Assembly at Edinburgh, July 21, 1567, Sess. 5.

“ Articles subscribed by Noblemen and Members of Assembly,
July 25, 1567.”

Item. That all kings, princes, and magistrates, which hereafter in any time to come shall happen to reign, and bear rule over this realm, at their first entry, before they be crowned and inaugurate, shall make their faithful league and promise to the true kirk, that they shall maintain and defend, and by all lawful means set forward the true religion of Jesus Christ presently professed, and established within this realm, even as they are obliged and astricted by the law of God in Deuteronomy, and in the first book of Kings, second chapter thereof, as they crave obedience of their subjects, so the band and contract to be mutual and reciprocal in all times coming betwixt the prince and God, and also betwixt the prince and his faithful people, according to the word of God.”

From Calderwood's MS. Hist. vol. ii. page 103.

*The 17th General Assembly holden at Edinburgh in the
Nether Tolbooth July 1, 1568.*

“ Book intituled the Fall of Antichrist by Bassenden, discharged, because it expresses the king as Supreme Head of the Kirk.”

“ In the third session, the Assembly ordained Thomas Bassandane printer to call in the books printed by him intituled *the Fall of the Roman Kirk*, wherein the king is called *supreme head of the primitive kirk, &c.* and to keep the rest unsold till he alter the foresaid title. Item, to delete the baudie song *Welcome Fortoun, &c.* printed in the End of the Psalm book without licence, and that he abstain in times coming from printing any thing without licence of the supreme magistrate, or if it concern

religion, of such as shall be appointed be the assembly to revise. Mr. Alexander Arbuthnot was appointed to revise the fornamed tractat and to report to the Assembly."

From Calderwood's MS. History, vol. ii. p. 137.

General Assembly at Edinburgh, July 5, 1569.

"The Assembly appointed the superintendent of Lothian, Mr. Knox, Mr. John Craig, and Mr. David Lindsay, to revise the acts of the General Assemblies, and note the acts which concern the common affairs of superintendents and ministers, and cause the same to be printed, and also the form of excommunication, with the inauguration of the superintendents and ministers."

General Assembly at Edinburgh, March 1569, Sess. 7.

"Anent Robert Lekprevik his supplication for support of the kirk in his office of printing—the kirk having respect to his povertie, the great expenses that he has made in buying of printing irons, and the great zeal and love he bears to serve the kirk at all times, has assigned to him fifty pounds, to be yearly paid of the thirds of the kirk by the collectors underwritten, viz. the collector of Lothian, to pay hereof 10 lib. the collector of Fife 10 lib. and the collector of Angus 10 lib. whilk sum the auditors of the comptis for the kirk shall thankfully allow to every ane of thame."—(*Buik of Universal Kirk*, p. 112.)

From Calderwood's MS. History, vol. ii. p. 462.

General Assembly at Edinburgh, August 1574, Sess. 6.

"It is understood to the General Assembly by credible report of certain learned men lately arrived within this country, that a French printer of the best renowned this day next Hen-

ricus Stephanus, being banished with his wife and family from his country, hath offered unto them to come in Scotland and to bring with him three thousand franks worth of books, and to print whatsoever work he should be commanded, in so much that there should not be a book printed in French or Almain but once in the year it should be gotten of him, if he might have sure provision of a yearly pension of 300 merks; which indeed is ane offer so comfortable to the country and kirk that it ought not to be overseen, that his grace will consider the same offer, and take order therewith."

" *Ib.* p. 464. Sess. 6. Forsamikle as by imprinting and putting to light of works repugnant to the truth of God's word, or containing manifest error, the weak ones of the earth may be heavily prejudged and seduced from the truth, therefore the General Assembly presently convened all in one voice have given power to their loved brethren Mr. Robert Pont provost of the Trinity College, Mr. James Lawson minister of Edinburgh, Mr. David Ferguson minister of Dunfermline, Mr. David Lindsay minister of Leith, Mr. Clement Little, one of the commissioners of Edinburgh, John Brand minister of Holyroodhouse, or any three or four of them conjunctly to visit and oversee all manner of books or works that shall be proposed to be printed, and to give their judgment thereupon, if the same be allowable and approved by the law of God or not, their judgment and opinion thereof by their subscription and handwritt to witness and testify for relief of such as shall read the said works, which commission of oversight foresaid the General Assembly willeth to endure firm and stable to their next Assembly.

For reviewing and sighting of the history of Job compiled by Mr. Patrick Adamson in Latin verse, the present Assembly hath willed their loved brethren the right honourable Mr. George Buchanan keeper of the privy seal, Mr. Peter Young pedagogue to our sovereign Lord, Mr. Andrew Melvill, Mr. James Lawson minister of Edinburgh, to take travell in perusing of the said book, and if the same be found by them agree-

able to the truth of God's word, to authorise the same with testimony of their handwritt and subscription."

No. LXIV.

Licence to Robert Lekprevik.

Feb. 8, 1565.

Ane letter maid makand mentioun that forsameikle as our souerane Lady vnderstanding of before That it was and is nocht onlie neidfull in commoun welthis to have the commoun lawis quhilkis ar the reule of the subdittis in ciuile thingis imprentit alsweile for the commoditie of the present aige as of the posteritie to cum Bot alsua all sic gude workes and volummes as tendis to the glorie of God Gaif and granted licence to her louit Robert Lekprevik Imprintar in Edinburgh to Imprint the actis of her hienes and predecessouris parliamentis according to the authentik copyis to be givin to him be the clerk of register, and to Imprint alsua the psalmes of Dauid in meter Chairgeing all and sindrie Imprintaris writtaris and otheris liegis within this realme or without the samen present and to cum That nane of thame tak vpoun hand to Imprint write or bring hame to be sauld the saidis actis of parliament or psalmes for the space of sevin zeiris except the said Robert under the pane of confiscation of the samin with command and charge to all and sindrie provestis baillies and officiaris of burrowis within our realme To put the said licence to dew execusion in all pointis like as her majesties licence under the priuie seile of the dait the xxij day of Marche last bipast at mair length proporis And that vpoun the samin licence the said Robert hes ellis Imprintit the said psalmis and is Imprintand the saidis actis of parliamentis Thairfore our saidis soueranis lord and lady ratifeis and apprevis the said licence grantit be hir Ma-

jestie of before to the said Robert as said is And of new gevis
 and grantis licence to him to Imprint the saidis actis of par-
 liamentis And with command in the samin to all and sindrie
 Imprintaris writtaris and vtheris oure soueranis lord and ladyis
 liegis within this realme or outwith the samin present and to
 cum That nane of thame take vpoun hand to imprint write or
 bring hame to be sauld the saidis actis of parliament or psalmes
 for the space of sevin zeiris nixt estir the day of the dait heirof
 Except the said Robert under the pane of confiscatioun of the
 samin That is to say The ane half to our saidis soueranes vse
 and the othir half to the said Robert &c. At Edinburgh the
 viij day of Februare The zeir of God Imvclxv zeiris

Per Signaturam.

Regist. Sec. Sig.

xxxiv. 53.

No. LXV.

License to Henrysoun to print the Laws.

June 1, 1566.

ANE Lettre maid be oure soueranis To thair wellbelouit
 clerk Edward Henrysoun doctoure in the lawis &c. Gevand
 and Grantand full power and license to him and his assignais
 alanerlie to Imprint or caus Imprint and sell the lawis and
 actis of parliament of thair Majesties Realme ; that is to say
 the buikis of law callit regiam majestatem and the remanent
 auld lawis and actis of parliament consequentlie maid be pro-
 gres of tyme vnto the dait of this present visitit sichtit and cor-
 rectit be the lordis commissaris speciallie depute to the said
 visiting sichting and correcting thairof. And that for the space
 of ten zeiris nixtocum dischairgeand and reuocand all other
 privilege and licence grantit of before to Robert Lekprevik or

ony otheris for imprenting of the saidis lawis and actis with command in the samin to the said Robert Lekprevik prentar and all vtheris oure soueranis liegis That nane of thame tak vpoun hand to Imprent or caus Imprent the saidis lawis and actis in this thair hienes realme or outwith the samin or to sell the samin within this their hienes realme vnder the pane of escheiting of the saidis buikis To thair said weilbelouit clerk And als vnder the pane of paying to him the somme of ij*l*li money of oure realme als oft as this thair hienes priuilege and licence beis contrauenit and broken be thame or ony of thame during the space of ten zeiris, &c. At Edinburgh the first day of Junii The zeir of God I^mvc^lxvj zeiris

Reg. Sec. Sig. xxxiv. 86.

Per signaturam.

No. LXVI.

Another Licence to R. Lekprevik, Jan. 14, 1567-8 referred to in *Petition* p. 8, 9,—and in *Answers*—Appendix, No. II.

Another Licence of Lekprevik to print the Inglis Bibill, April 14, 1568—in *Petition* p. 8. *Answers*—Appendix No. III..

No. LXVII.

Nov. 11, 1570.

ANE Lettre maid to Robert Lekprevik Imprentare to the kingis majestie in Edinburgh gevand him privilege to imprint all and quhatsumeineir actis werkis volumes and otheris neces-

saris alsweile in latin as in engles for the weile and commodi-
 tie of this realme and liegis thairof And alsua all sic thingis
 as tendis to the glorie of God induring the space and termes of
 twenty zeiris nixt following the dait heirof Chargeing all and
 sindrie imprentaris writtaris and otheris liegis within this
 realme That nane of thame tak vpoun hand to imprent or
 caus be imprentit be quhatsumeuer persoun or personis owthir
 within this realme or outwith the samin in ony tyme heirefter
 induring the said space the werkis volumes and writtis vnder-
 written or caus bring hither the samin out of vther cuntrieis or be-
 ing brocht hither out of vther cuntrieis or imprentit that thai nor
 nane of thame tak vpoun hand to sell the samin to otheris Ex-
 cept onlie the said Robert Lekprevik quha is alreddy and salbe
 nemmit during the said space our souerane lordis imprentare
 Thai ar to say the buke callit donatus pro pueris Rudimentis
 of Pelisso The Actis of Parliament maid or to be maid The
 cronicle of this realme The buke callit regia majestas The
 psalmes of Dauid with the Inglis and Latine Catechismes les
 and mair The buke callit The Omeleis for reidaris in kirkis
 Togidder with the Grammar callit the generall grammar to be
 vsit within the sculis of this realme for eruditiooun of the zouth
 And that vnder the pane of confiscatioun of the samin werkis
 and buikis that salhappin to be imprentit quhaireuir thai may
 apprehendit And failzeing thairof to pay the prices of the
 samin quhilk salbe tane vp to the said Robertis vse for his
 dampnage and entres Togidder with the sowme of twa hun-
 dredth pundis vsuall money of this realme quhairof the ane half
 salbe applyit to our souerane lordis vse and the vther half to
 the said Robertis with expres command &c. At Edinburgh
 the xj day of November The zeir of God I^mvc^{lx} zeiris.

Per signaturam.

No. LXVIII.

Apud Halyruidhous 29. Julij, 1574.

My Lord Regent's grace and Lordis of secret counsall, understanding quhat harme and danger it may breed gif all personis at thair plesoure soll imprent and divulgat materis unsene and viseit, gif thai be godlie and tollerable in the commounwelth or not. For eschewing of the same dangearis and all inconveni-entis that heirefter may occur in this behalf, Ordanis letters to be direct to officiaris of armes, sheriffs in that part, Chargeing thame to pass, and in our Soverane Lordis name and auctoritie, command and charge all and sindrie his hienes liegis, That nane of thame tak upoun hand to imprent or sell quhatsumevir buik, ballett, or uther werk imprentit within this realme in tyme cuming after the dait heirof, quhill the same buik, ballett, or uther werk be visijt, sene, and allowit be the Chancellor and utheris personis, constitute be our Soverane Lordis commissioun to that effect, or ony thre of thame (ane of the Lordis of Privie Counsall being ane of that nowmer,) and our Soverane Lordis speciell licence and privilege grantit thair-upoun, thairefter under the pane of deid and confiscation of all the guidis moveable of the contravenaris heirof. And that ther be a register keippit be the Secretar, or his deput of the licences, and privilegeis to be grantit for eschewing of confusion, and that the libertie of the prenting of ane thing be not given to twa personis at anis.

Reg. Sec. Sig. Acta, Nov. 1572—Dec. 1575.

No. LXIX.

Extract from Records of the Town Council of Edinburgh.

Lekprevik Prentar.

Secundo Junii 1570.

The quhilk day in presence of the baileis and Counsale Nic-
hole Fyldor is becum Cautioner and Sourtie for Robert Lak-

previk prentar under the pane of one hundred merks that the said Robert sal not fra this furth prent bukes ballettes or ony wark of consequence without the licence of the provost baillies and Connseale, and Lakprevik obliis him to relief Fylder.

No. LXX.

*Anent Balletis. Town Council Register, vol. ii. fol. 34.
xix Octobris anno 1554.*

The quhilk day It is Statute and ordanit be the provest baillies and consale fforsamekle as the provest baillies and consale vnderstanding that dyvers tymes bygane yr has bene dyvers and syndry evill gevin personis despittars and dispeisars of ye Jugis of the burgh and utheris thair ny^tburis that hes contrar the commoun lawis maid balletis of defamatioun blasphematioun and detractioun and leif the samyn in secrete placis in wrift patent to the commoun pepill quhairby dyvers personis honest men hes suspekit utheris be presumption And thairby hes maid discord alwayis the makars theirof not beand knawand Quhair-foir It is Statute and ordanit bi the saidis provest baillies and consale That in tyme cuming no manner of persone of quhat suever degré he be of Tak upon hand to mak ony sic balletis as said is owther prevatlie or oppinlie vnder the paneis contentit in the commoun law Certifing all sic personis that hes maid oney in tymes bygane that the Juge sall mak diligence for getting of Informatioun thairof and that thai salbe punest conforme to the saidis lawis.

No. LXXI.

*Town-Council Register, vol. ix. 1589—1594. fol. 183^b.
ij^o February 1592.*

The same day anent the sindrie complaynts gevin in before thame be Henry chairters Robert smyt Androw hairt Thomas gibsoun Edward cathkyn Ro^t wodhous Jhoun symsoun, bwik-sellaris and burgess of this burgh againis Jhoun nortoun Inglesman and Edmond wats his seruand for the wrangus vsurping of the libertie of this burgh they being vnfreemen In taking vpon thame To haif and hald ane oppin chalmer upoun the foregaitt w^tin the said burgh q^rin thai had and hes ane greit number of bwiks of all sorts quhilk thai tak furth and sellis in smallis als weill bund as vnbund to all o^r Souerane lords lieges at all tymes. And albeit yai haif bene dischraigett be yair (l.) of the samyn zitt yai still continewit in zair wonted tred not regairding bot contemnand yair (l.) authoritie to the greitt hurt^t of the privileges of this burgh and friemen thairof berand all portabill chairges w^tin the samyn—and will in na wayis desist and ceis thairfra w^tout yai be compellit The said complaners comperand be the said Androw hairt and Jhoun gibsoun and the said Jhoun nortoun beand personallie present Thair *ressouns* and allegatiouns hard and considderit and yairw^t beand rypelie anysit The said baillies and counsall decernis and ordanis the said Jhoun nortoun and the said Edmond his seruand To desist and ceiss fra all copping and selling of ony sort of bwicks in smallis in howses buith chalmeris or other places w^tin the said burgh and libertie thairof privatlie or oppinli and fra all haldin buith or chalmers to that effect In all tyme coming vnder Payne of confiscatioun of the said bwiks swa oft as thai failzie according to the laitt act of parliament maid anent the privilege of burrowes and vsing merchandice Q^rvpoun the said Androw hairt asket instrumentis.

No. LXXII.

Gift of Printer to his Majesty's Family to Peter Bruce.

Dec. 31, 1687.

JAMES, &c.—Forasmuch as we taking into our royal consideration, that by the late deceas of James Watson, the place and office of printer to our family in our ancient kingdom of Scotland is now vacant in our hands, and at our gift and disposition. And being now graciously resolved to bestow the same upon Peter Bruce, as a person sufficiently qualified for discharging the dutie of the same: Therfor, witt ye us to have nominat, made, constitute and ordained, lykeas, we by these presentis, &c. the said Peter Bruce to be printer to our family, in our said kingdome, during all the dayes of his life; giveing, granting, and disponeing unto him, dureing the space forsaid, the place and office of our printer aforsaid, with all and sundry fees, forfeits, benefits, casualties, immunitiess, freedomes, privileges, and others quhatsomever, pertaineing, belonging, or that shall be known hereafter to pertain and belong to the same, as fully and freely in all respects and conditions as the said place and office was, or might have formerly been enjoyed by the said deceast James Watson, or any others authorized by him in the same, and particularlie, without prejudice of the said generality; with full power, liberty, and sole privilege to the said Peter Bruce, and such persons as shall be employed by and under him, of printing prognostications within our said kingdome, prohibiteing hereby and dischargeing all other printers, and other persons whatsomever, from presumeing to print any prognostications ther, without his speciall licence and approbation, as they will answer the contrair at their perrills. Given under our privie seall, at our Court at Whythall, the threttie one day of December, I^mvj^c Eightie Sevne years, and of our reigne the thrid year.

Regist. of Privy Seal, vol. iv. p. 248.

No. LXXIII.

Extracts from the Records of the Presbytery of Edinburgh, and of the Synod of Lothian and Tweeddale.

Ediu. xii. Nov. 1594.—The brethren present approvis the treatise pennit be Mr. Robert Pont ganis sacraledge, and thinkis it meitt to be prentit.

iii. Oct. 1598. Ordanis ane article to be given to the nixt Provinciall Assemble that the said Assemble may condescend upon sum commoun forme of catechising to be usit in all the kirkis.

Extract from the Record of the Synod of Lothian and Tweeddale, prefixed to Davidson's Catechism, printed by Robert Waldegrave, Edin. 1602.

“At Edinburgh the vii. of November 1599.—The Provinciall Assemblie of Lothiane and Tweddale, having red and considered the form of Examination and Catechisme, written by our brother Maister John Davidson, approves the same, and agrees that it sall bee imprentit.” Extract furth of the books of the provinciall assemblie of Lothiane and Tweddale, by mee Richearde Thomesone clerk thereto.

RICHARDE THOMSONE.

No. LXXIV.

Act and Reference concerning the Publishing a Version of the Scriptural Songs.

At Edinburgh, April 27, 1708.—The General Assembly do instruct and appoint their Commission maturely to consider the

printed version of the Scriptural Songs, with the remarks of Presbyteries thereupon ; and after examination thereof, they are hereby authorised and empowered to conclude and establish that Version, and to publish and emit it for the public use of the Church as was formerly done on the like occasion, and when our Version of the Psalms was published in the year 1649 ; and seeing there are many copies of the said Version lying on the Author's hand, it is recommended to Ministers and others to buy the same for private use in the meantime.

No. LXXV.

Act of the Assembly, at Edinburgh, 1st June, 1781,
Sess. 8.

“ THERE was produced, read, and agreed to by the General Assembly, the Report of the Committee concerning *the Translations and Pharaphrases, in verse, of several passages of Sacred Scripture*, which had been prepared by a Committee of a former Assembly ; and the General Assembly, in terms of said report, did, and hereby do, appoint these Translations and Pharaphrases to be transmitted to the several Presbyteries of this Church, in order that they may report their opinion concerning them to the ensuing General Assembly ; and, in the mean time, they allow this Collection of Sacred Poems to be used in public worship, in congregations where the Ministers find it for edification. The General Assembly likewise renew the appointment of the Committee : with power to judge of any corrections or alterations of these Poems that may be suggested previous to their transmission ; and with directions to cause a proper number of copies, with such corrections as they may approve, to be

printed, for the consideration of Presbyteries, and for public use. They ordain the expense already incurred by printing this Collection for the inspection of the Members of this Assembly, to be defrayed out of the public funds of the Church. And in order to prevent it from being afterwards printed in a careless and incorrect manner, they authorise and appoint the Printer to the Church to print and publish it for sale, under the direction of the Committee. And that he may be enabled to sell the copies at a moderate price, the General Assembly did, and hereby do, grant to him the exclusive privilege of printing and publishing this Collection of Translations and Paraphrases for the term of Five Years."

Extracted by JOHN DRYSDALE, Cl. Ecc. Scot.

No. LXXVI.

Overture to the General Assembly.

AT Ayr, 9th April, 1793, which day the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr being met and constituted, the Committee of Overtures transmitted an overture of the following tenor, viz. "Whereas it is notorious that the late common edition of the Bible is printed so imperfectly, and on such bad paper, as to be almost illegible, it is overtured, that proper means be used that the Bible shall be printed in such a distinct manner, and on such paper, that it may be read with ease by the common people."

(Signed) JAMES RICHMOND.

Which overture the Synod having considered, they unanimously adopted the same, and appointed it to be transmitted to the ensuing Assembly; and they recommend to the Com-

missioners to the Assembly within the bounds of this Synod, to support this overture before the Assembly.

Extracted by ROBERT CLASON, *Synod Clerk.*

At Edinburgh, Monday May 20, 1793.

The General Assembly being convened, the Overture from the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr respecting the more accurate and better printing of the common editions of the Bible, was ordered to lie on the the table till to-morrow.

Tuesday, May 21, 1793.

The overture anent the more correct printing of common Bibles ordered to lie on the table till Thursday afternoon.

Friday, May 24, 1793.

The General Assembly resumed the consideration of the overture from the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, respecting the more accurate printing of common Bibles ; and the Overture being again read, a letter from the King's printer to the moderator was also read ; and along with it specimens of a new edition of the common Bible were produced. The Assembly feel it their bounden duty to pay every attention to the printing of the Bible ; but upon considering the letter from his Majesty's printer, and having viewed the said specimens which were given in, they think it unnecessary to proceed any farther in this matter at present.

LXXVII.

COPY—Overture from the Synod of Perth and Stirling, anent Printing the Larger Catechism of this Church.

April 15, 1794.

AT Perth, the fifteenth day of April, one thousand, seven hundred and ninety four years: Which day the Provincial Synod of Perth and Stirling being met and constituted, there was transmitted to them by their Committee for Overtures, an overture anent printing a new edition of the Larger Catechism of this Church; which having been read, was agreed to, and appointed to be transmitted to the General Assembly; the tenor whereof follows: “Whereas the Larger Catechism of this Church, agreed upon by the Assembly of Westminster Divines, is now out of print; it is humbly overtured by the Synod of Perth and Stirling, that the General Assembly should give orders to the Printer for the Church, to publish a new impression of this Catechism; the Synod being convinced that it will be the means of diffusing amongst the body of the people, a more perfect acquaintance with the doctrines of our Holy Religion.” The Synod ordain this Overture to be given in to the Committee for Overtures at the General Assembly, and enjoin such of their brethren as shall be Members of Assembly to support the same.

Extracted from the Records of the Synod of Perth and Stirling, by

(Signed) JOHN DUNCAN, C. C. SYN.

At Edinburgh, Friday May 23, 1794.

The General Assembly being convened, the Overture from the Synod of Perth and Stirling anent printing the Larger

Catechism of this Church, being read, upon a motion made, the Assembly unanimously agreed that it shall be recommended to the printer for the Church, to cause a new impression of the said Larger Catechism to be printed with all convenient speed.

No. LXXVIII.

Extracts from Records of the Church concerning the Bible, Confession, and Catechisms in the Gaelic or Irish Language.

Acts of the General Assembly 1690.

Edinburgh 11. Nov. 1690.

THIS day the Overtures following anent the *Irish Bibles, New Testaments and Catechisms* were read in presence of the Assembly.

“ 4. That it be recommended to the agent for the kirk to receive the Books above mentioned, being 3000 *Bibles*, 1000 *New Testaments*, and 3000 *Catechisms* from London.

5. That the several Synods, who have *Highland Parishes* in their bounds, appoint one of their members to receive their proportion of the said *Bibles, New Testaments, and Catechisms*; and that in order thereto, the ministers and elders having interest in the *Highlands*, present in this Assembly, shall meet and appoint some to receive these *Bibles, &c.*

6. That it be recommended to the ministers concerned in the *Highlands* to dispatch the whole paraphrase of the *Irish Psalms* to the press: and if the principal copy can be recovered, to expedite the same; but that any other copy they have, be revised by the Synod of *Argyle*, and being approven by them, that the same be printed.”

The Assembly having considered these Overtures, they approve thereof, and recommend and appoint accordingly.

At Edinburgh, Aug. 11. 1725.

This being one of the stated quarterly meetings of the Commission appointed by the Assembly, &c.

There was presented and read a petition of Thomas Lumisden Printer, the tenor whereof follows: "Unto the Right Reverend and Honourable the Moderator and remanent members of the Commission of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, the Petition of Thomas Lumisden Printer in Edinburgh, Humbly Sheweth, That it having been the care of the General Assemblies of this Church to have the knowledge of Christ propagated in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland, and a Reformation carried on there, Libraries were sent to divers places therein, and also Bibles in Irish: But there never having been any translation of the Confession of Faith and Catechisms of this Church in that language, the people are at a great loss thereby, and this having been under the Assembly's Consideration anno 1708, they referred to the Synod of Argyle to cause prepare a Translation of the said Confession and Catechisms in the Irish Language, which they having done did make their Report to the General Assembly 1709. But they not having a fund for printing the same; it lay over till the year 1713; that the Assembly did refer the matter to their Commission: But their funds being exhausted and considerable demands thereon for some time then to come, the Right Honourable John Campbell Esq. now Lord Provost of Edinburgh, was pleased to give some encouragement to this undertaking, and thereupon the printing was begun. But the Printer having died a little thereafter, the book stopped, and the Petitioner having bought part of the types belonging to the Printers for the Church, as also got their rights to some accounts due by the Church, with some Books on hand, and this among the rest, not then finished, and being employed for some time to print the Church's papers, the Petitioner did set about the finishing of this work, and now has got it complete: And seeing the Petitioner had a prospect of being printer to the

Church when he undertook this work, and that it was upon the faith thereof that he ventured so far, it would be very hard that he should be deprived of the Church's employment, and come also to so great a loss by this work. He therefore lays his case before this Reverend Commission, that they may be pleased to consider how to dispose of this impression for the use of the Church. He has printed only about 2000 copies thereof. The Prelatical party have been at much expence in distributing their common prayer book among the people, and it were a pity that so valuable a book as the *Confession of Faith* and *Catechisms, the public standards of the doctrine of this Church*, should not be put in the hands of so considerable a party of its members, when the same might be so very useful. It is well known money is very scarce in that country, and there are many more scholars in those places by the care of that excellent society for propagating Christian knowledge than used to be; and these scholars may be very useful to their aged parents and other relations who cannot read, if this book were put in their hand; but they cannot so soon be in case, though they can read, to turn what they read into Irish; but this book being done to their hand will be a great help. May it therefore please the Rev. Commission to consider the premisses, and to cause take the said Impression off the Petitioner's hand and dispose thereof as you shall think fit: This matter concerning Libraries, Irish Bibles, Psalm books and Catechisms being in your instructions, and I am not in case to lie out of money. And your Petitioner shall ever pray (Sic subscribitur) THOMAS LUMISDEN." The Commission having heard the said Petition, they appointed Messrs John Cuming, Neil Campbell, &c. a Committee to consider what is therein set forth, and to report their opinion thereon to the Commission, and to meet for that end at the rising of the Commission this night in the Assembly house.

At Edinburgh, August 12, 1726.

The Committee appointed to consider Thomas Lumisden's Petition made their Report, and the same being read and con-

sidered by the Commission, they did approve of it, and in the terms thereof do offer it as their humble opinion and overture to the next Assembly that the impression of the Confession of Faith and Catechisms in the Irish Language should be taken off the said Thomas Lumisden's hand at the price of sixpence the piece unbound, and that it should be referred to the Committee for reformation of the Highlands and Islands to distribute the same to proper persons as they shall see cause, and that the Assembly should give the said Thomas a precept for the price of the said impression, payable out of the Church's public money, so soon as all prior debts of the Church are paid, and that the said precept should bear annual rent from the date thereof.

At Edinburgh, May 6, 1726.

Upon Report of the Committee for the public money, the General Assembly declare, that they cannot grant any precepts or orders on the Procurator for any money till the debts already contracted and stated be first paid; but that the Impression of the Confession of Faith and Catechisms in Irish be taken off Thomas Lumisden Printer in Edinburgh his hands, according to, and in terms of the opinion of the late Commission, and for the ends therein mentioned.

No. LXXIX.

Extracts from the Records of the Church of Scotland, concerning Watson's edition of the Confession of Faith.

At Edinburgh, May 17, 1726.

It is remitted to the Commission to have under consideration the reference of the last General Assembly to their Commission about the new impression of the Confession of Faith, &c. and to do what they can to bring that matter to a good issue.

At Edinburgh, Nov. 10. 1726.

The Brethren from the Presbyteries within the Synod of Perth and Stirling produced an Instruction from their Synod,* requiring them to move in the Commission, that they will take under consideration the reference of the late Assembly concerning the new edition of the Confession of Faith, Catechisms, and other books authorised by this Church, and take care that the things complained of about that work in the Instruction may be helped. The Commission appointed their Committee named 19 May last to consider the Overtures about preaching and planting of parishes, &c. to take likewise this Reference under their consideration and report some overtures thereabout to the meeting in March next.

At Edinburgh, March 9, 1727.

The large Committee of the Commission did report that they had at several meetings taken under consideration the Reference of Assembly concerning the late edition of the Confession of Faith and other books authorised by this church, and had hopes given them, that a third volume would come abroad which would remove all the grounds of complaint that have been made in that matter, and some had been named to deal with the Editors to that effect; and it is the Committee's opinion that yet farther pains should be taken to persuade the editors to finish that work as soon as they can. The Commission having heard this Report, they recommended to such

* The Instruction was in these words;—“ At Stirling, 12th April 1726. The Provincial Synod of Perth and Stirling hereby instruct the Commissioners from the several Presbyteries within their bounds to the ensuing General Assembly, that they insist that if the editors of the new edition of the Confession of Faith do not insert into the same the Solemn League and Covenant, the act of Assembly 1647, approving the Confession of Faith, and the Sum of Christian knowledge, the venerable Assembly shall declare that they had no concern in that matter, especially seeing the church were pleased to take notice of that edition.”

of the brethren and elders as have most interest with the said Editors to labour to persuade them to hasten the publishing of the 3d volume of the said Collection, and to make it so complete as that all grounds of complaint may be removed.

At Edinburgh, May 18, 1727.

The instruction given to the last Commission concerning the new edition of the Confession of Faith, and other books authorised by this church is renewed, and the Commission appointed to consider the same, and do therein as they find cause.

At Edinburgh, August 9, 1727.

The Commission of the General Assembly appointed a Committee to search the Registers, and to report what has been done in this affair.

At Edinburgh, August 11, 1727.

The Committee appointed to search the Registers of the Assemblies, and their Commissions, to see what has already been done in the question that has so long depended about the late edition of the Confession of Faith, and other books authorised by this Church, reported, that they had obeyed the appointment, and found that in August 1717, the Commission, upon the desire of some who had a design of printing our Confession of Faith and Catechisms, appointed a committee of their number to oversee the printing thereof, and grant their assistance: That on the 29th May 1718, report is made by the foresaid committee, that they had performed what was recommended to them, and a new committee is appointed to revise and correct with all due care and diligence, the remaining books; and May 26, 1719, the Commission renews their appointment upon the said Committee, and adds some to them;—November 11, 1725, the Commission, according to their powers, do appoint the said Committee to make a report in March thereafter, that it might appear whether they had answered their instructions or not, and whether thereby it would further appear that the editions, in the years 1721 and 1722, is to be looked upon only as the *deed of private men*, or as having been done by the authority of the Church, that the Commission might declare the fact accordingly;—March 31, 1726, the Commission called for the Report of the Committee, and received the same, but found reason to delay the consideration thereof, and to agree to an overture that this affair continue to be committed by the next Assembly to the ensuing Commission, they being in hopes that before another Assembly shall meet, matters may be so ordered as to give general satisfaction concerning the things complained of in that work, but they found not the report itself in the records, but in a paper apart, bearing date December 6, 1725; but they now produced it, that it might be considered by the Commission. The Commission having heard the said Report, delayed the further consideration of it until another meeting, and appointed the

moderator, Messrs. Samuel Semple, &c. to speak with the editors as to this affair.

At Edinburgh, Nov. 9, 1727.

[The Commission appointed a new Committee.]

At Edinburgh, March 14, 1728.

The Committee appointed to consider the Edition of the Confession of Faith and Catechisms of this Church, Reported, that having met and considered the said affair, find as follows, viz. That in the Records of the Commission, dated the 29 of May 1718, page 209, they find it insert, That the Commission of the Gen. Assembly finding that they are instructed by the said Assembly to take care that the Impression of the Holy Scriptures, the Confession of Faith, Catechisms and other Books relating to the Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Government of this Church be Correct, and it appearing that the last Commission had appointed divers Rev. Ministers and Elders to Revise an Edition of the Confession of Faith and Catechisms of this Church, which was then preparing, and to take care that they should be freed from these Errors that have Crept into former Editions, and be rendered as Correct and Beautiful as might be, which hath been accordingly performed. But this Committee are of Opinion that the foresaid approbation does not reach any further than the approving of the Correctness and Beauty of the Impression so far as it was then carried on, and that it does not appear that the Commission had in their view the Omitting in that Edition of the Confession of Faith, Larger and Shorter Catechisms, Compiled at Westminster, the Acts of Assembly 1647 & 1648, approving of the said Confession of Faith and Catechisms Respectively. And the Committee finds not that the Preface prefixt to the 1st volume and written in general for an excellent design, was compiled or prefixt by the order of an Judicatory of this Church. As to the 2d volume this Committee represent that it appears to them from the Records of the Commission, dated 31 of March 1726, page 550, about the middle), that a Committee appointed by the Commission of Assembly anno 1718, to Inspect the Impression of the Confession of Faith, Catechisms and other Books authorised by this Church being required to meet and prepare their Report of what was done by them to be laid before that meeting of the Commission, did accordingly meet and Report as follows, viz. That it was agreed in one of their meetings, That the Westminster Confession of Faith, with the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, and Directory for family worship, should be published as the first volume, as being most necessary, which was accordingly done, and the Committee was therein approven by the Commission May 29, 1718. Likeways it was agreed in another meeting of the Committee, That the other Confessions of Faith, Catechisms, and Books relating to the Doctrine, Worship, Discipline, and Government of this Church should be Correctly printed according

to the order of time in which they were authorised. And the Committee Reports that there is one volume published, intituled, “a Collection of Confessions of Faith, Catechisms, Directories, Books of Discipline, &c. of publick authority in the Church of Scotland. Together with all the acts of Assembly, which are standing rules concerning the doctrine, worship, government and discipline of the Church of Scotland.” Volume second containing a Correct and Beautiful Edition of the Confession of Faith, Catechisms, Directory, Books of Discipline, &c. authorised by this Church from the Reformation according to the said appointment. But this Committee find that this Report is not Insert in the Records of the Commission, but was Lodged in the Clerks hands in a paper apart, and the Committee does not find in the Records that the Commission gave any judgment upon that Report, Or that they had interposed in directing or advising what was to be published or left out in the 3d volume. But the consideration of the said Report was delayed, and an Overture was agreed to be made to the Ensuing Assembly, that the affair should still be continued under the consideration of the Commission which they should appoint, being in hopes that before another General Assembly should meet matters would be so ordered as to give a general satisfaction concerning the things that had been formerly complained of about that work ; and it does not appear that any such thing has yet been done in that matter since that time, and therefore upon the whole, the Committee were humbly of Opinion that any *omissions or imperfections* which may be in that performance *are not chargeable upon the Judicatories of the Church.* The foresaid Report being read in the presence of the Commission and compared with these parts of the Registers referred to in the said Report, and being at length discoursed upon, It was put to the vote Delay this affair or not, and the Roll being called and votes marked, it carried in the negative. Thereafter it was put to another vote Approve of the Report and opinion of the Committee or not, and the Roll being again called and votes marked, it carried Approve, and therefore the Commission Did and hereby Do Approve and Declare according to the abovewritten opinion of their Committee.

At Edinburgh, May 13, 1728.

The General Assembly having heard the Report of those appointed to revise the Register of the actings and proceedings of the Commission of the late General Assembly, and having heard their remarks, and the Commissioners their answers, &c. and nothing appearing censurable, they ordered their clerk to attest this in their books.

JO. DUNDAS, CL. EEC. SCOT.*

* From the above Extracts it is evident that the General Assembly did not claim much credit for the part which had been taken by the Committee employed in the revision of the Confession of Faith printed by Watson.



VARIETY OF BIBLES PRINTED IN ENGLAND.

*None corresponding to those marked * are printed in Scotland.*

		Where Printed	£	¶	0
oyal Folio, double pica type.		Camb. and Oxf.	£4	8	0
emy do.	do.	Camb.	2	16	0
al Quarto, pica type.		Lond.	2	5	0
<i>(Blaney's Marginal References) Apocrypha, Index, &c.</i>					
best ink.		Oxf.	2	0	0
edium Quarto, double pica, Ref.		Camb. and Oxf.	1	0	0
edium Quarto, <i>Blaney's Ref.</i> pica type.		Lond.	1	10	0
emy — Pica type, index, &c.		Oxf.	0	12	10
iy quarto, inferior.		Camb.	0	6	5
rown Quarto, References.		Oxf.	0	14	5
oyal Octavo small pica type.	Camb. Lond. and Oxf.		0	16	0
oyal Octavo, small pica type, <i>Blaney's</i> References.	Oxf.		0	12	0
edium Octavo, small pica type.	Lond.		0	8	5
oyal Octavo, long primer type, best ink, and cold pressed, best paper.	Lond.		0	14	5
emy Octavo, long primer type, best ink, and cold pressed.	Lond.		0	7	3
oyal Octavo, brevier type (<i>Blaney's Marginal References</i> and Apocrypha) fine wove paper, best ink, cold pressed.	Lond.		0	18	4
edium Octavo, brevier type, <i>Blaney's Marg. Ref.</i>	Lond.		0	9	8
oyal Octavo, brevier type, without Refs.	Camb. and Oxf.		0	10	5
edium Octavo, small pica letter, fine.	Oxf.		0	8	5
edium Octavo with References.	Camb.		0	12	0
edium Octavo, Mar. References.	Camb.		0	8	5
edium Octavo, small pica.	Camb.		0	7	3
edium Octavo, brevier type, best ink, cold pressed.	Lond.		0	9	3
y Octavo, brevier type, best ink, cold pressed.	Lond. Camb. and Oxford		0	5	3
emy Octavo, minion type, large paper, best ink, cold pressed.	Lond.		0	8	10
own Octavo, minion type.	Camb. Lond. and Oxf.		0	4	5
own Octavo, fine, with References.	Oxf.		0	8	5
emy Twelves, nonpareil type	Lond. Camb. and Oxf.		0	2	10
do. fine paper.	Camb.		0	5	8
do.	Lond.		0	4	5
do. inferior.	Camb. Oxf. and Lond.		0	2	5
ty-Fours, minion type, fine wove royal paper, best ink, cold pressed.	Lond.		0	6	0
minion type, royal paper.	Lond. and Oxf.		0	4	0
nonpareil type, fine.	Camb.		0	4	5
do. common,	Camb. and Oxf.		0	2	10
pearl type, fine.	Camb. Lond. and Oxf.		0	4	5
diamond type, the smallest ever printed, best ink.	Lond.		0	12	0

NEW TESTAMENTS.

y Octavo, pica type.	Lond.	Camb.	Oxf.	0	2	5
emy Octavo, long primer type.	Lond.			0	1	5
own Octavo, long primer type.	Camb.			0	1	5
oyal 12mo. long primer type.	Oxf.			0	1	5
emy 12mo. fine, brevier type.	Lond. Camb. Oxf.			0	1	0
o inferior.	Lond. Camb. and Oxf.			0	0	10
nty-Fours, minion type.	Lond. and Oxf.			0	1	0
do. nonpareil type.	Camb. and Oxf.			0	1	0
do. pearl type.	Lond.			0	1	0
nty-Fours, diamond type, columns, best ink, cold pressed.	Lond.			0	3	9
yal 32mo. fine.	Oxf.			0	1	2
ty-eights, diamond type, long lines, best ink, cold pressed, the smallest ever printed.	Lond.			0	3	0

N. B.—Bible Societies can purchase these Books much lower than the prices quoted.

EDITIONS PRINTED FOR THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY.

BIBLES.

	£ s. d
Quarto, with Blaney's references, pica letter, royal paper	0 14
Octavo, small pica letter, royal, superfine paper, and best ink	0 14
Octavo, small pica letter, marginal references, superfine, royal	0 10
Octavo, small pica letter, medium paper	0 7
Octavo, long primer letter, demy paper	0 6
Octavo, brevier letter, marginal references, fine demy	0 8
Octavo, brevier letter, demy paper	0 4
Octavo, minion letter, marginal references, crown paper	0 7
Twelves, minion letter, fine royal paper, best ink	0 3
Twelves, nonpareil letter, demy paper	0 2
Twenty-fours, minion letter, royal paper	0 3
Twenty-fours, pearl letter, royal paper	0 3
Twenty-fours, pearl letter	0 2

NEW TESTAMENTS.

Octavo, pica letter, fine demy paper	0 2
Octavo, long primer letter, demy paper	0 1
Twelves, brevier letter, fine demy paper, and best ink	0 0 1
Twenty-fours, minion letter, fine royal paper, best ink	0 0 1

EDITIONS OF THE SHORTER CATECHISM.

Edinburgh printed and sold by John Moncur	170
Edinburgh by J. Watson	171
Glasgow by John Robertson, &c.	171
Edinburgh in Pearson's close	171
Glasgow by John Robertson, senior	171
Edinburgh by Thomas Lumsden and Co.	171
Edinburgh by E. Robertson	171
London (beautiful edition.)	printed in the year 171
Glasgow printed and sold by John Robertson	171
Glasgow by John and James Robertson	171
Edinburgh by David Paterson, Castlehill	171
Edinburgh by David Paterson	171
Edinburgh by David Paterson	171
Edinburgh by David Paterson	171
Edinburgh by J. Robertson	171
Edinburgh printed for the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge	171
Edinburgh by Alexander Robertson	171
Edinburgh by J. Robertson	171
London by W. Kent, High Holborn	171
Most of those are superior to the King's Printers' editions 1806 and 1810.	

The Book of Proverbs is the only part of scripture which continues to be printed by the unprivileged printers. Many of the editions are very coarse, but in general they are correct. We have seen only two editions which distinguish the supplied words by a different character. This attention has been overlooked in the respectable editions of P. Hill, 1820, and James Lumsden, 1823, and in the much neatest edition printed for Oliphant, Waugh and Innes, 1813.

EDITIONS OF THE CONFESSTION OF FAITH

Not printed by His Majesty's Printers, with the exception of No. 23.

Edinburgh	printed by G. Lithgow, printer to the University	1650, 18mo.
London	for the Company of Stationers	1652, 18mo.
Edinburgh	printed for the heirs of George Anderson	1652, do.
Edinburgh	by Gideon Lithgow	1656, 18mo.
Edinburgh	by Andro Anderson	1657, 18mo.
London	printed by A. Maxey for the Company of Stationers	1658, 4to.
London	by E. M. for the company of stationers, 2d edition	1658, 4to.
London	Do. do. larger paper and larger type	1658, 4to.
Edinburgh	by Gideon Lithgow	1659, 18mo.
Glasgow	by Robert Sanders, printer to the Town	1669, 18mo.
Edinburgh	printed by James Glen and David Trench	1671, 18mo.
Glasgow	by Robert Sanders, printer to the city and university (the edition used by the Presbytery of Dundee)	1675, 4to
[The title bears that this is reprinted from the edition printed at London for the Company of Stationers, 1658.]		
A neat and correct edition (used by the Presb. of St. Andrews)		1688, 18mo.
Edinburgh	printed by John Reid	1689, 18mo.
Edinburgh		1694, do.
Edinburgh	by James Watson, Craig's Close	1701, 12mo.
Edinburgh	by James Watson in Craig's Close	1707, 8vo.
Edinburgh	by James Watson in Craig's Close	1708, 8vo.
Edinburgh	by James Watson, opposite the Luckenbooths	1710, 8vo.
Glasgow	by Hugh Brown, printer to the University (the edition used by the Kirk Session of Kirkaldy)	1714, 18mo.
Edinburgh	by John Moncur,	1715, 18mo.
London	printed for S. Cruttenden and T. Cox, Cheapside, 5th edit. (the edition used by the Presbytery of Forfar)	1717, 8vo.
Edinburgh	printed by James Watson, H. M. printer, 2 vols. 8vo.	1719, 1722.
[This edition was to have been in 3 vols. but was never completed. It wants the directory for public worship, form of church government, &c. and contains various matters which are not of public authority in the church.]		
Glasgow	by James Duncan, printer to the city	1721, 18mo.
Edinburgh	by William Brown and Company	1723, 12mo.
Edinburgh	by Thomas Lumsden and John Robertson	1725, 12mo.
Glasgow	by James Duncan	1727, 18mo.
Edinburgh	by T. Lumsden and J. Robertson	1727, 8vo.
Edinburgh	by Thomas Lumsden and John Robertson	1728, 12mo.
Glasgow	by William Duncan, Saltmarket	1732, 18mo.
Glasgow	by James Duncan	1732, 18mo.
Edinburgh	by T. Lumsden and J. Robertson	1735, 8vo.
Glasgow	by Messrs. Carmichael and Miller	1736, 12mo.
Edinburgh	by T. Lumsden and J. Robertson	1736, 8vo.
Edinburgh	by T. Lumsden and J. Robertson	1739, 8vo.
Glasgow	Collection of Confessions	1741, 12mo.
Glasgow	by Urie and Company	1743, 12mo.
Edinburgh	by T. Lumsden and J. Robertson	1744, 8vo.
Edinburgh	by T. Lumsden and J. Robertson	1744, 12mo.
Glasgow	by J. Robertson and Mrs. M'Lean	1745, 18mo.
Glasgow	by J. Robertson	1746, do.
Glasgow	by J. Robertson and Mrs. M'Lean	1746, 8vo.
Glasgow	by J. Robertson and Mrs. M'Lean	1749, 8vo.
Glasgow	by W. Duncan	1749, 8vo.
Glasgow	by John Robertson, senior	1753, 8vo.
Glasgow	by J. Bryce and D. Paterson	1755, 12mo.
Edinburgh	by E. Robertson	1756, 12mo.
Edinburgh	by E. Robertson	1756, 8vo.
Glasgow	by Arch. M'Lean	1757, 8vo.
Edinburgh	by E. Robertson	1757, 12mo.
Glasgow	by John Bryce	1761, 12mo.
Glasgow	for R. Duncan, Saltmarket	1761, 8vo.
Glasgow	by William Duncan	1762, 8vo.
Glasgow		1763, 8vo.
Glasgow	by John Bryce	1764, 8vo.
Glasgow	by R. & A. Foulis (the edit. used by the presb. of Nairn)	1765, 8vo.
Glasgow	for Alexander Weir, Paisley	1769, 8vo.
Glasgow	by Robert and Thomas Duncan	1771, 8vo.
Edinburgh		1771, 8vo.

EDITIONS OF THE PSALMS IN METRE

Not printed by His Majesty's Printers, with the exception of Evan Tyler's.

Edinburgh	printed by Evan Tyler, printer to the King	1650
Edinburgh	by Gideon Lithgow, printer to the University	1650
Edinburgh	by Gideon Lithgow	1651
Edinburgh	by Gideon Lithgow	1655
Edinburgh	by Gideon Lithgow	1656
Edinburgh	by A. Anderson, before he was King's Printer	1669
Glasgow	by Robert Sanders, printer to the Town	1669
Edinburgh	by G. Swinton and T. Brown	1671
Edinburgh	by G. Swinton	1675
Edinburgh	for a Society of Stationers	1690
Edinburgh	by G. Mosman, printer to the Church of Scotland	1693
Edinburgh	by Mosman	1694
Edinburgh	by James Watson	1711
Edinburgh	by heirs of A. Anderson	1714
Edinburgh	by T. Lumisden and J. Robertson	1729
Edinburgh	by M'Euene and Co.	1730
Glasgow	by R. Smith and A. Hutcheson	1744
Edinburgh	by R. Fleming and Co.	1744
Edinburgh	by Lumsden and Robertson	1744
Glasgow	by W. Mitchell and James Knox	1751
Edinburgh	by W. Gray	175
Edinburgh	by Hamilton, Balfour, and Neill	1751
Edinburgh	by E. Robertson	175
Glasgow	by John Bryce, 12mo.	175
Glasgow	by William Duncan, senior	1760
Edinburgh	by C. Wright and Co.	175
Edinburgh	by W. Ruddiman and J. Richardson	176
Glasgow	for John Bryce	176
Glasgow	for John Orr	176
Glasgow	by W. Duncan, sen.	176
Edinburgh	for John Wood	176
Glasgow	by John Bryce	177
Edinburgh	by Robert Clark	177
Glasgow	by James Robertson	177
Dundee	by Ogilvie and Chalmers	177
Edinburgh	by Colin M'Farquhar	177
Edinburgh	by Alexander M'Caslan	177
Edinburgh	by Peter Williamson, 8vo.	177
Edinburgh	by Peter Williamson, 12mo. (six copies in one of the Trades Seats of St. Andrews)	177
Glasgow		177
Paisley	for Alexander Weir	177
Edinburgh	by Archd. Neill	177
Glasgow	for J. and J. Robertson (Used in the Pulpit of the city of St. Andrews.)	177
Glasgow	for J. Robertson and J. Duncan	177
Edinburgh	by John Gray and Gavin Alston	177
Edinburgh	by A. Tweedie	177
Glasgow	by J. & J. Robertson	177
Dumfries	by Robert Jackson	177
Edinburgh	by P. Williamson	177
Glasgow	by Robertson, (used in pulpit of St. George's, Paisley)	177
Edinburgh	by J. Dickson (used in the pulpit of Tolbooth Church)	177
Glasgow	for J. Duncan	177
Falkirk	by Daniel Reid	177
Glasgow	by David Niven (in the Bible of the South Church Dundee)	177
Edinburgh	by J. Dickson, (printer to the Church of Scotland)	177
Glasgow	by Daniel Niven	177
Glasgow	by J. and M. Robertson,	177
Glasgow	for J. Dickson	177

inburgh	for J. Dickson and P. Hill (a copy of this edition is used by the Moderator of the General Assembly)	1792
inburgh	J. Moir	1793
inburgh	for the booksellers (16 Copies used by the Town-Council of Edinburgh.)	1793
sgow	by J. and M. Robertson	1793
rth	by R. Morison (used by precentor of Canongate) (7 copies used by Magistrates of St. Andrews)	1794
sgow	by J. and M. Robertson	1796
inburgh	by J. Dickson, (printer for the Church of Scotland)	1797
inburgh	for, and sold by J. Gillies, Glasgow	1798
r	by J. & P. Wilson	1798
inburgh	by Geo. Caw, for J. Gibson, J. Fairbairn, and J. Ogle, Edinburgh (Used by Magistrates of Cupar, by the Minister of Fala, and also by Precentor of Tron Church)	1798
isley	by Neilson and Weir	1798
sgow	by R. Chapman	1798
linburgh	by T. Macleish and Co.	1798
linburgh	by J. Ruthven and Sons	1799
linburgh	by J. Dickson (pulpit of Tron Church)	1799
linburgh	by T. Ross	1799
sgow	by David Niven (pulpit of old Aberdeen)	1799
isley	by J. Wilson	1801

DITIONS OF THE CONFESSION OF FAITH IN LATIN.

antab.	excudebat J. Field	1659
lasg.	excudebat A. Anderson, impensis Soc. Stat.	1660
dinb.	ex officina Soc. Stationariorum	1670
lasg.	excudebat R. Sanders	1670
dinb.	ex officina Soc. Stationariorum	1689
dinb.	ex officina typographica G. Mosman	1694
dinb.	excudebat Jac. Watson	1711

Edinburgh, Jan. 18, 1649.—The commission of the General Assembly, considering how profitable it will be to the kirks abroad, that the Confession of Faith and Catechisme be translated in Latine, therefore they seriouslie recommend to Mr. John Adamson and Mr. Thomas Crawford to doe the same with diligence.

Application has been made to a number of Towns and Parishes, requesting to know what editions of the Bible are used, either by the Ministers in the Pulpits, or by the public bodies in the seats which they occupy.

The following are the only returns:

Whitburn.	Pulpit Bible, Folio, with Ostervald's notes, printed for S. Archer, Belfast, M. Keene, Dublin, and Mundell, Doig, and Stevenson, Edinburgh.	Belfast 1811
Perth.	East Church, pulpit, quarto.	Oxf. 1786
	West do. do. quarto.	Edin. 1793
	St. Paul's do. do. folio.	Edin. 1773
	Three churches of St. John's, folio.	Lond. 1708
	East Church, former Bible.	Lond. 1777
	Magistrates, 2, quarto.	Oxf. 1817
	7, quarto.	Edin. 1793
Glasgow.	Glassite Meeting-house, folio.	Camb. 1763
	High Church, quarto.	Edin. 1822
	Outer High Church, quarto.	Lond. 1813
	Blackfriars, quarto.	Oxf. 1743
	St. David's, Watson's, folio.	Edin. 1722
	St. Mary's, 4to.	Edin. 1793
	St. Andrew's, folio.	Oxf. 1794
	St. Enoch's, quarto.	Edin. 1822
	St. George's, quarto.	Edin. 1822
	St. John's, quarto.	Lond. 1813
	St. James's, quarto.	Lond. 1813
	Of eight Dissenting Chapels, reported, three have	Lond. 1813
St. Andrews	Town Church, old pulpit Bible, folio.	Lond. 1611
	Another copy, with Geneva notes, folio.	Lond. w. t.
	(This is an edition printed in Holland, about 1682.)	
St. Leonard's	Church, quarto, printed by M. Ritchie, Middle Street, Cloth Fair, for John Wright, Piccadilly.	Lond. 1796
St. Andrews.	Provost's Bible, quarto.	Camb. 1768
	6 Magistrates and Counsellors, quarto.	Edin. 1762
	7 Psalm Books, R. Morison. Perth. 1794	Camb. 1762
	St. Mary's College, Principal's seat, quarto.	Camb. 1762
	2 Professors, quarto.	Camb. 1762
	1 Professor.	Lond. 1772
	Trades, all Edinburgh Bibles, except Sailors, 1 8vo. Bible.	Oxf. 1750
	6 Psalm Books, by Peter Williamson. Edin. 1773	Camb. 1762
	4 Psalm Books, printed for the Booksellers. 1793	Camb. 1762
	Pulpit Psalm Book, by J. and J. Robertson. Glasg. 1775	Camb. 1762
Cupar.	Pulpit Bible, (Watson's,) folio.	Edin. 1722
	Dean of Guild.	Oxf. 1755
	Magistrates, (Kincaid.)	Edin.
	Psalm Book, by George Caw, for J. Gibson, &c.	Edin. 1798
Ayr.	Pulpit, quarto.	Edin. 1793
	Provost.	Edin. 1806
Anstruther.	Pulpit.	Camb. 1789
Pittenweem.	Pulpit.	Edin. 1814
Haddington.	Pulpit, quarto.	Oxf. 1769
	Another, quarto.	Edin. 1793
	Magistrates, five copies, quarto.	Lond. 1687
	Do. quarto.	Edin. 1726
	Do. quarto.	Edin. 1793
	Elders, folio.	Lond. 1638
Garvald.	Pulpit, quarto,	Camb. 1789
	Psalm Book, J. Moir. Edin. 1793	
Morham.	Pulpit, quarto.	Edin. 1791
Yester.	Pulpit, Dutch plates—no place or printer's name	1683
	Another, do.	1707
Athelstaneford.	Pulpit, folio, Dutch edition.	said to be Lond.
Aberdeen.	West Church, 1 copy folio.	Lond. 1617
	Another, folio.	Sheffield 1785
	Another, quarto.	Cambridge 1789

perdeen.	Reverend Mr. Bryce, quarto	Oxford 1779
	Reverend Mr. Foote, quarto	Edinburgh 1791
	Reverend Mr. Murray, quarto	Edinburgh 1793
	Lord Provost, quarto	Oxford 1762
	8 Magistrates and Counsellors, octavo	Oxford 1759
	11 Ministers of Chapels and Dissenting Meetings, have Edinburgh Bibles for the pulpit.	
larmnock.	Pulpit Bible, quarto	London 1813
	2 Do. do.	Edinburgh 1793
	Do. do.	Oxford 1817
	Magistrates	Edinburgh 1762
	Pulpit Bible	London 1634
	Gifted by Sir Alexander Bruce—July 20th 1636.	
lross.	Old Pulpit Bible, folio.	London 1611
	Another, folio.	Oxf. 1795
undee.	Magistrates, 6 copies octavo.	London 1772
	5 ditto quarto. Edin. 1726. 6 ditto ditto. Edin. 1762	
	Old Church, precentor's desk, folio.	Lond. 1638
	Old and South Churches, 2 pulpit Bibles.	Edinburgh 1789
	1 do.	Oxford 1754
	Cross and Steeple Church 1	Oxford
	2	Edinburgh 1822
	St. David's	Amst. 1672
	1 folio	Edinburgh 1823
	1 quarto	
	St. Andrew's Church, 1 quarto	Oxford 1772
	Convener of Three Trades, 1 quarto	Oxford 1786
	Deacons of Three Trades, 3 octavo	Oxford 1772
	Convener and Deacons of Nine Trades, 10 copies	Edinburgh 1772
	Old Church Precentor's desk, folio	London 1638
	South Church, black letter	London
unkeld.	Pulpit Bible, folio	Lond. 1772
ittle Dunkeld.	Do.	Edin. 1793
	Dunkeld Glassite Chapel, folio	Oxf. 1680
anark.	Old Pulpit Bible, folio	Lond. 1616
ochmaben.	Pulpit Bible, folio	Edin. 1793
	Communion Bible, quarto	Lond. 1806
inburgh.	High Church pulpit, folio	Camb. 1763
	Another (a present from the late King's printer) folio	Edinburgh 1793
	Lord President's Bible	Lond. 1796
	Lord Provost's Bible, quarto	Lond. 1767
	Dean of Guild, quarto	Lond. 1767
	16 Psalm Books, Edinburgh, printed for the booksellers.	1793
	Old Church, quarto	Oxford 1682
	Gifted to the Ministers in 1684 by four of the Elders.	
	Another copy, folio	Edinburgh 1793
	Tolbooth, quarto	Oxford 1777
	New North Church, quarto	Oxford 1777
	Another, quarto, (purchased since the interdict was granted)	Edin. 1822
	Lady Yester's, quarto	Oxford 1786
	Psalm Book (Pulpit) D. Niven, Glasgow, 1799	
	Psalm Book, (Precentor) printed for the Booksellers.	Edin. 1796
	College, quarto	London 1813
	Another	Edinburgh 1793
	Old Greyfriars, folio	Edinburgh 1722
	St. Andrews, quarto	London 1813
	St. George's, quarto	Oxford 1808
	St. Cuthbert's Chapel, quarto	London 1813
	Another	1793
	New Greyfriars Church	Oxford 1723
	Another (a present from the late King's printer, an elder of that Church)	Edinburgh 1793
	Tron Church, quarto	Oxford 1777
	Psalms for Pulpit, J. Dickson. Edinburgh 1798	
	Do. for Precentor G. Caw. Edinburgh 1798	
	Pulpit Bible, quarto	Lond. 1806

Ecclesmachin.	Pulpit Bible, folio	Lond. 1616
North Leith.	Pulpit Bible, folio	Lond. 1672
South Leith.	Magistrates, three, quarto, Edin. 1765. One, ditto Edin. 1808	
	Kirk Session, octavo	Lond. 1703
	Another, quarto	Edin. 1720
	Incorporations, quarto	Edin. 1793
	Pulpit Bible, folio	Baskerville, Camb. 1763
Canongate.	Pulpit Bible	Oxf. 1786
	Another (purchased since the interdict was granted.)	Oxf. 1786
	Communion Bible	Edin. 1793
Forfar.	Pulpit Bible, quarto	Lond. 1761
	Magistrates Bibles, three quarto	Lond. 1766
	Three ditto ditto	Oxf. 1768
	Two ditto ditto	Edin. 1775
	Six ditto ditto	Edin. 1793
Dunfermline.	Pulpit Bible, folio, Watson	Edin. 1722
	Another	Lond. 1813
	Magistrates, quarto	Edin. 1793
	Convener, quarto	Camb. 1789
	Chapel of Ease Pulpit Bible	Edin. 1793
	Psalm Book for the Pulpit, G. Caw. Edin. 1798	
	Ditto, for Precentor, G. Caw. Edin. 1798	
	Queen Anne Street Chapel, Pulpit Bible, quarto	Edin. 1793
	Psalm Book for Pulpit, G. Caw. Edin. 1798	
	Ditto, for Precentor. Edin. 1798	
	Chambers' Street Chapel, Pulpit Bible, quarto	Edin. 1793
	Cannon Street Pulpit Bible, quarto	Lond. 1806
Kilconquhar.	Folio, printed for Stephen Swart, at the Crowned Bible, on the west side of the exchange	Amst. 1679
	This copy, as stated by the Minister, has been a Pulpit Bible for more than a century. It was first Principal Drew's (of St. Leonard's College and Parish;) then his son-in-law's, Mr. McCormick, Minister of St. Andrews; then Principal McCormick's (of St. Leonard's Parish;) and now it is used by his son-in-law, Dr. Ferrie.	
Linlithgow.	Pulpit Bible, folio	Edin. 1793
	Magistrates, five Bibles, quarto	Camb. 1769
	Guildry, five Bibles quarto	Camb. 1767
	Shoemakers, seven Bibles quarto	Camb. 1769
	Bakers, three Bibles quarto,	Edin. 1799
	Mr. Watson's Pulpit Bible, quarto	Oxf. 1817
	Mr. Miller's ditto, folio	Edin. 1793
	Mr. Knowles' ditto, quarto	Edin. 1814
Borrowstounness.	Pulpit Bible, quarto	Camb. 1789
	Mr. Harper's Pulpit Bible, quarto	Lond. 1813
Auchtermuchty.	Pulpit Bible, quarto	Edin. 1822
	(A Present from the Patron of the Parish, John Bruce, Esq. one of his Majesty's Printers.)	
Dollar.	Pulpit Bible, folio	Baskerville, Birming. 1769
	Another, quarto	Edin. 1808
	Psalm Book, by Morrison. Perth 1794	
Colinton.	Pulpit Bible	Basket, Edin. 1726
Creich.	Pulpit Bible, folio	Baskerville, Birming. 1769
	Another, folio	Lond. 1762
Old Machar.	Pulpit Bible	Edin. 1793
	Another, Precentor's desk	Oxf. 1685
	Psalm Book, for Pulpit. Niven. Glasg. 1799	
Monimail.	Pulpit Bible	Oxf. 1729
	Another	Edin. 1763
Paisley.	Abbey Church Pulpit Bible quarto	Edin. 1775
	St. George's Church, Pulpit Bibles:—	
	One copy with Ostervald's Notes, given by the Town-Council, quarto	
		Glasg. 1775

aisley.	Another, given by the Town-Council, ditto	Edin. 1808
	Another, quarto	Lond. 1818
	Psalm Book, printed by Robertson. Glasg. 1780	
	High Church Pulpit Bible, (two copies) quarto	Edin. 1793
	Middle Church, Pulpit Bible, quarto	Edin. 1793
	Magistrates, four Bibles, quarto	Edin. 1793
	Do. three Bibles (with Ostervald's Notes)	Glasg. 1775
irkaldy.	Pulpit Bible, folio	Baskerville, Birm. 1769
	Psalm Book, by Morison. Perth 1794	
alkeith.	Another. Edin. 1807	
	Pulpit Bible	Oxf. 1783
rechin.	Psalm Book, J. Dickson	Edin. 1783
	Pulpit Bible, folio (no printer's name)	Lond. 1708
also.	Another, folio	Edin. 1793
oberton.	Seven Magistrates	Edin. 1799 and 1814
irktown.	Two Pulpit Bibles	Lond. 1768, and Lond. 1806
est Calder.	Pulpit Bible	Oxford, 1786
umfries.	ditto	Camb. 1775
	ditto	Oxford, 1701
	St. Michael's Church, quarto	Lond. 1763
rbroath.	New Church, folio	Edin. 1793
	Another, folio, with notes	Ormskirk 1809
	Four Magistrates, quarto	Lond. 1772
	Two ditto quarto	Camb. 1769
	Six Psalm Books, R. Jackson. Dumfries, 1774	
	Pulpit Bible, quarto, wants title	
	Another, folio	Lond. 1679
	Six Magistrates, octavo	Edin. 1787
	One do. do.	Edin. 1716
ercromby.	Associate Congregation	1786
	Pulpit Bible, quarto	Edin. 1793
	Psalm Book, by G. Caw. Edin. 1798	
	Minister's Bible	Lond. 1700
	Another	Oxf. 1765
rauraer.	Pulpit Bible, quarto	Lond. 1813
unbarton.	Pulpit Bible, quarto	Lond. 1813
	Another, quarto	Edin. 1775
	Psalm Book. Glasg. 1799	
	Magistrates' Bibles, 4 copies, quarto	Glasg. 1778
ontrose.	Pulpit Bible, quarto	Edin. 1793
	Another, in precentor's desk	Lond. 1765
	Magistrates' Bibles, 8 copies	Edin. 1744
	Five Psalm Books. Glasg. 1799	
	Three ditto. Glasg. 1794	
uldearn.	Pulpit Bible, quarto	Lond. 1806
airn.	Pulpit Bible, quarto	Edin. 1785
urrie.	Pulpit Bible, quarto	Oxford, 1790
lgin.	Psalm Book, by J. Dickson. Edin. 1799	
irriemuir.	Pulpit Bible, folio	Lond. 1753
	Pulpit Bible, folio	Lond. 1759
	Another, folio	Camb. 1789
ddlestone.	Pulpit Bible, folio	Lond. 1772
raquair.	Pulpit Bible, folio	Camb. 1762
ow.	Pulpit Bible, quarto	Oxford, 1786
iberton.	Pulpit Bible, quarto	Oxford,
ramond.	Psalm Book. Glasg.	
	Pulpit Bible, quarto	Oxford,
	Another	Lond. 1767
	Psalms, Lumsden. Edin. 1746	
ianor.	Pulpit Bible	Camb. 1789
obo.	Pulpit Bible	Lond. 1678
olton.	Pulpit Bible, folio	Lond. 1638
edburgh.	Rebound, 13th Nov. 1704, by order of Mr. Sinclair, mi-	
	nister, with consent of the heritors and elders.	
	Pulpit Bible (Presented by the heritors in 1773.)	Birm. 1767
	Another, (Dr. Somerville's father's Pulpit Bible)	Oxford, 1727
	Pulpit Bible, quarto	Lond. 1781
umbie.	Another, quarto (Presented by the heritors in 1821.)	Oxford, 1817

Copies of the Bible printed in England, having Psalms for the Church of Scotland bound in the same Volume,—all printed between the date of Arbuthnot's Patent, (1579,) and the commencement of Freebairn's in 1712.

All these (except one) belong to a single individual.
Bible. Psalms.

Lond.	1582,	Geneva Translation,	folio,	Edinburgh, 1699
Lond.	1587,	ditto,	4to,	A. Hart, Edinburgh, N. D.
Lond.	1587,	ditto,	8vo,	Psalms for Scotland, London, 1587
Lond.	1590,	ditto,	4to,	Edinburgh, 1650
Lond.	1593,	ditto,	4to,	N. D.
Lond.	1596, N.	Testament, Geneva,	4to,	Edinburgh, 1696
Lond.	1599,	ditto,	4to,	Heirs of A. Hart, Edinburgh, 1632
Lond.	1599,	ditto,	4to,	Edinburgh, 1643
Lond.	1599,	ditto,	4to,	N. D.
Lond.	1601,	ditto,	12mo,	Psal. for Scotland, Middleb. 1596
Lond.	1607,	ditto,	folio,	Edinburgh, 1699
Lond.	1608,	ditto,	4to,	Edinburgh, 1650
Lond.	1608, N.	Testament, Geneva,	12mo,	Middleb. 1596
Lond.	1608,	ditto,	4to,	A. Hart, Edinburgh, N. D.
Lond.	1610,	ditto,	4to,	Edinburgh, 1650
Lond.	1611,	ditto,	4to,	Lumsden, Edinburgh, 1746
Lond.	1614,	King James' Translation,	12mo,	Psalms for Scotland, Middleb. 1596
Lond.	1615,	Geneva Translation,	4to,	A. Hart, Edinburgh, 1615
Lond.	1615,	K. James Translation,	4to,	A. Hart, Edinburgh, 1615
Lond.	1623,	ditto,	12mo,	Edinburgh, 1756
Lond.	1629,		4to,	Edinburgh, 1615
Lond.	1629,		4to,	Edinburgh, N. D.
Lond.	1638,	ditto,	4to,	Bryson, Edinburgh, 1640
Lond.	1638,		4to,	Edinburgh, 1714
Lond.	1647,	do. by Comp. of Stationers,	8vo,	G. Lithgow, Edinburgh, 1651
Camb.	1648,		18mo,	Edinburgh, 1650
Camb.	1648,		18mo,	D. Gray, Edinburgh, 1754
Lond.	1648,—	Comp. of Stationers,	4to,	G. Lithgow, Edinburgh, 1655
Lond.	1649,		4to,	G. Lithgow, Edinburgh, 1655
Lond.	1653,—	Field,	24mo,	Edinburgh, N. D.
Lond.	1653,—	Calvert,	18mo,	Edinburgh, 1650
Lond.	1660,		4to,	G. Lithgow, Edinburgh, 1656
Lond.	1661,		4to,	G. Lithgow, Edinburgh, 1655
Camb.	1668,		4to,	A. Anderson, not K. P. 1671
Camb.	1668,		4to,	Edinburgh, 1669
Camb.	1668,		4to,	G. Lithgow, Edinburgh, 1656
Camb.	1668,		4to,	Mosman, Edinburgh, 1693
Lond.	1669,		12mo,	A. Anderson, not K. P. 1671
Lond.	1669,		12mo,	(another edit.) Edinburgh, N. D.
Lond.	1669,		8vo,	(another edit.) N. D.
Lond.	1672,		folio,	Edinburgh, 1679
Lond.	1675,		4to,	Edinburgh, 1650
Lond.	1675,		12mo,	T. Brown, Edinburgh, 1675
Camb.	1675,		4to,	Edinburgh, 1676
Lond.	1680,		12mo.	Edinburgh, 1676
Lond.	1682,		12mo,	Edinburgh, 1688
Lond.	1682,		8vo,	Edinburgh, 1675
Oxf.	1683,		4to,	Edinburgh, 1681
Lond.	1685,		8vo,	Edinburgh, 1698
Lond.	1685,		4to,	Edinburgh, 1692
Lond.	1694,		8vo,	Edinburgh, N. D.
Lond.	1695,		8vo.	Edinburgh, 1698
Lond.	1695,		8vo,	Edinburgh, 1675
Lond.	1698,		18mo.	Edinburgh, 1698
Lond.	1698,		12mo,	Edinburgh, 1698
Lond.	1700,		4to,	Edinburgh, 1661
Lond.	1704,		8vo,	Mosman, Edinburgh, 1693
Lond.	1712, 2 copies,		8vo,	Edinburgh, N. D.

tions of the Bible, printed beyond Seas, subsequently to the Edition by Arbuthnot and Bassandyne in 1579.

All in possession of a Member of the Edinburgh Bible Society.

, with Psalms, as they are to be sung in the Kirk of Scotland. Imprint- by Isaac Canin, at the expenses of the aires of Henrie Charteris and drew Hart in Edinburgh, 8vo. at Dort	1601
, imprinted at Amsterdam for Thomas Craooth, 4to.	1633
, at Amsterdam, by Thomas Stafford, folio	1640
according to the copy printed at Edinburgh by Andro Hart, in the year 1610")	
le, folio, at Amsterdam, for Stephen Swart	1672
le, folio, at Amsterdam, for Stephen Swart	1679
le, octavo, Leipzig, for John Grosse's Heir	1746

tions of the Earliest Version of the Psalms for the Church of Scotland, and of the original Scottish Confession of Faith, &c.

(Not printed by any of His Majesty's Printers for Scotland.)

All belonging to a Member of the Edinburgh Bible Society.

Psalms, Catechism, &c. for the Church of Scotland, T. Bassanden	Edin. 1578
ms for the Church of Scotland	T. Vautrollier, Lond. 1587
Psalms, with the Book of Common Order, for the Church of Scotland	Middleburg, 1594
o, printed by Henrie Charteris	Edin. 1594
o, printed by Henrie Charteris	Edin. 1596
Psalms of David in Metre, used in the Kirk of Scotland	Middleburg, 1596
Confession of Faith, Catechism, &c.	Dort, 1601
ms, with Confession and Catechism	A. Hart, Edin. 1611
ms, with Confession	A. Hart, Edin. 1615
ms in Prose and Metre	A. Hart, Edin. 1617
chism, appointed to be printed for the use of the Kirk of Edinburgh	A. Hart, Edin. 1615
ms, for the Church of Scotland	E. Raban, Aberdeen, 1629
ms (in Prose and Metre) with Confession	Heirs of A. Hart, Edin. 1630
The Prose Psalms are of the Geneva Translation.	
ms, according as they are sung in the Church of Scotland	Heirs of A. Hart, Edin. 1633
Psalms in Metre, according to the Church of Scotland	E. Raban, Aberdeen, 1633
Psalms of David in Prose and Metre, according to the Church of Scot- land	Aberdeen, 1633
(The Psalms in Prose on the Margin (said to be) according to the New Translation 1610.)	
Psalms of David in Prose and Metre	Heirs of A. Hart, 1634
(The Psalms in Prose are of the Geneva Translation.)	
Psalms of David in Prose and Metre	Heirs of A. Hart, 1635
(The Prose Psalms of the Geneva Translation.)	
Psalms of David in Prose and Metre	James Bryson, Edin. 1640
(The Prose Psalms of the Geneva Translation.)	

*tions of the New Testament in the possession of a Member of the
Bible Society, printed in Scotland, during the last century, by printers
who at the time had no patent.*

o	by James Watson, Craig's Closs, Edin	1706
ves	by Mr. Thomas Ruddiman, Edin.	1725
ves	by Alexander Carmichael and Alexander Millar, Glasg.	1737
ves	by John Robertson and M. M'Lean, Glasg.	1748

EDITIONS OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE

*In the Libraries of the Universities of Scotland.**(No Bible in these Lists has been printed by any of the Scottish Patentees.)**Bibles in the Library of the University of Edinburgh.*

The Great Bible, folio, ("gifted by William Reid, son of Bailie Reid, 1670,")	Lond. 1541
Bible, (Genevan) quarto, inscribed "Bible belonging to the Royal College of Chirurgeons, Edin. 1761."	Lond. 1599
With Psalms, Bryson, Edin. 1640	
Bible, (Genevan) folio.	Amst. 1640
Inscription, "Ego donatus sum Academiæ Edinburgensem a Magisterii Candidatis." A. D. 1641.	
Bible, (King James's Translation) quarto.	Camb. 1668
2 Copies; one presented by the candidates for the degree of A. M. in 1668.	
Bible, (King James's translation, with Geneva notes) folio.	Lond. 1679
[N. B. In the accounts for the years 1668 and 1679, these entries appear,—Field's new impression of the Bible, with Jackson's, Concordance, Camb. 1668, 10 lib. A new English Bible, of the edition London, 1679, with Annotations, Maps, Scots Psalms, 18 lib.]	

Bible, folio.	Oxf. 1771
Bible, with notes by Bishop Wilson	Bath, 1785
Bible, with notes by Adam Clarke, LL.D.	Liverpool, 1813
Bible, (Popish translation) quarto.	Doway, 1633

Bibles, Psalm Books, and Confessions of Faith in the Library of the University of Glasgow.

Coverdale's	supposed 1535
Matthew's	Lond. 1531
Tindale's	imprinted by Whitechurch, Lond. 1553
Doway	1609
Bible	Barker, Lond. 1613
New Testament, the Rhemes translation	Fulke, Lond. 1601
Confessio Fidei, &c.	Edin. 1680
Psalms in Prose and Metre	Aberdeen, 1633

Bibles, &c. in the Library of King's College, Aberdeen.

1. Bible, printed 1541, printer's name effaced.	
2. Do. 1562, Richard Harrison, London.	
3. Do. in small quarto, wants title.	
4. Do. small size	Bill and Barker, Lond. 1663
Confession of Faith, with Dunlop's Preface, 2 vols.	Edin. 1719-22
Do. do.	Lond. 1717
Do. Latin	Cantab. 1650
Do. do.	Gid. Lithgo, Edin. 1660

Marischal College.

Bible	Barker, Lond. 1605
Bible	Macklin's, Lond. 1800

Bibles, &c. in the University of St. Andrews.

Cranmer's Bible, folio.	Rouen, 1560
The Bishop's ditto, folio.	Lond. 1571
Bible folio, Field's	Camb. 1651
Do. 12mo.	Lond. 1721
Do. Dodd's, 3 vols.	Iond. 1777
Do. Brown's, 3 vols.	Edin. 1778
Do. Wilson's, 3 vols.	Bath, 1781
Do. Clarke's	Liverpool, 1811
Do. Cadell and Davies	Lond. 1811
Do. Clarke's	Lond. 1811
Do. D'Oyly and Mant's	Oxf. 1811
Do. Scott's, 6 vols.	Lond. 1822
New Testament,	Rhemes, 1580
Do. Fulke's	Lond. 1600
Do. do.	Lond. 1633
Do. (Common Translation,) 8vo.	Lond. 1722

EDITIONS
OF
BOOKS OF PUBLIC AUTHORITY
IN THE
CHURCH OF SCOTLAND,
NOT PRINTED BY SCOTTISH PATENTEES,
See p. 28.

[THESE LISTS, WITH SOME ADDITIONS, ARE REPRINTED IN 1839.]

EDITIONS OF THE EARLIEST VERSION OF THE
PSALMS FOR THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND, AND
OF THE ORIGINAL SCOTTISH CONFESSION OF
FAITH, &c.

Not printed by any of His Majesty's Printers for Scotland.

(COPIES OF THESE AND VARIOUS OTHERS ARE POSSESSED BY DR. LEE, A MEMBER
OF THE EDINBURGH BIBLE SOCIETY.)

The Psalms, Catechism, &c. for the Church of Scotland, T. Bassanden, Edin.	1578
Psalms for the Church of Scotland	T. Vautrollier, Lond.
The Psalms, with the Book of Common Order, for the Church of Scotland,	Middleburg, 1594
Ditto, printed by Henrie Charteris	Edin. 1594
Ditto, printed by Henrie Charteris	Edin. 1596
The Psalms of David in Metre, used in the Kirk of Scotland	Middleburg, 1596
Confession of Faith, Catechism, &c.	Dort, 1601
The Psalms of David in Metre	R. Charteris, Edin. 1603
Psalms, with Confession and Catechism	A. Hart, Edin. 1611
Psalms, &c. Geneva Translation,	R. Barker, Lond. 1614
Psalms, with Confession	A. Hart, Edin. 1615
Psalms in Prose and Metre	A. Hart, Edin. 1617
Catechism, appointed to be printed for the use of the Kirk of Edinburgh	A. Hart, Edin. 1615
Psalms for the Church of Scotland	E. Raban, Aberdeen, 1629
Psalms (in Prose and Metre) with Confession	Heirs of A. Hart, Edin. 1630
(The Prose Psalms are the Geneva Translation.)	
Psalms, according as they are sung in the Church of Scotland	Heirs of A. Hart, Edin. 1633
The Psalms in Metre, according to the Church of Scotland	E. Raban, Aberdeen, 1633
The Psalms of David in Prose and Metre, according to the Church of Scotland	Aberdeen, 1633
(The Psalms in Prose on the Margin (said to be) according to the New Translation, 1610, that is, the Geneva.)	
The Psalms of David in Prose and Metre	Heirs of A. Hart, 1634
(The Psalms in Prose are of the Geneva Translation.)	
The Psalms of David in Prose and Metre	Heirs of A. Hart, 1635
(The Prose Psalms are of the Geneva Translation.)	
The Psalms of David in Prose and Metre	James Bryson, Edin. 1640
(The Prose Psalms are of the Geneva Translation.)	
Psalms, Proverbs, &c., New Translation	Robert Bryson, Edin. 1642

DR. LEE POSSESSES MORE THAN 120

EDITIONS OF THE PSALMS IN METRE,
AUTHORISED BY THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND IN 1649,Not Printed by His Majesty's Printers, with the exception of
Evan Tyler's.

Edinburgh	printed by Gideon Lithgow, small edition	1650
Edinburgh	by Gideon Lithgow, printer to the University, another ed.	1650
Edinburgh	by Evan Tyler, printer to the King	1650
Edinburgh	by Gideon Lithgow	1651
Edinburgh	by Gideon Lithgow	1653
Edinburgh	by Gideon Lithgow	1655
Edinburgh	by A. Anderson	1655
Edinburgh	by Gideon Lithgow	1656
Edinburgh	by A. Anderson, before he was King's printer	1669
Glasgow	by Robert Sanders, printer to the Town	1669
Edinburgh	by G. Swinton and T. Brown	1671
Edinburgh	by A. Anderson	1671
Edinburgh	by G. Swinton	1675
Edinburgh	for a Society of Stationers	1679
Edinburgh	by G. Mosman, printer to the Church of Scotland, 4 sizes	1690
(In 1693, Geo. Mossman printed editions of the Psalms in 4to. for Bibles, —8vo. for Bibles,—12mo. for Precentors, and 18mo. as pocket Psalm book.)		1693
Edinburgh	by G. Mosman	1694
Edinburgh	by James Watson	1702
Edinburgh	by James Watson	1711
Edinburgh	by Heirs of A. Anderson	1714
Edinburgh	by T. Lumisden and J. Robertson	1729
Edinburgh	by R. Fleming and Co.	1730
Edinburgh	by M'Euen and Co.	1730
Glasgow	by Carmichael, Brown, and Millar	1733
Edinburgh	by T. Lumisden and J. Robertson	1738
Aberdeen	by D. Angus	1740
Edinburgh	by T. Lumisden	1740
Edinburgh	by T. Lumisden and J. Robertson	1741
Glasgow	by A. Millar	1741
Glasgow	by R. Smith and A. Hutcheson	1744
Edinburgh	by R. Fleming and Co.	1745
Edinburgh	by Lumisden and Robertson	1746
Glasgow	by J. McCallum and Co.	1747
Edinburgh	by T. Lumisden and J. Robertson	1748
Edinburgh	by W. Gray	1748
Glasgow	by W. Mitchell and James Knox	1751
Edinburgh	by W. Gray	1751
Glasgow	by R. Urie	1751
Aberdeen	by Chalmers	1754
Dundee	by H. Galbraith	1756
Edinburgh	by Hamilton, Balfour, and Neill	1756
Glasgow	by John Hall	1756
Glasgow	by W. Duncan	1757
Edinburgh	by R. Fleming, <i>two editions</i>	1757
Edinburgh	by E. Robertson, <i>two editions</i>	1757
Glasgow	by John Bryce	1757
Edinburgh	by C. Wright and Co.	1757
Dundee	by H. Galbraith and Co.	1759
Glasgow	by William Duncan, senior.	1760

Edinburgh	printed by W. Ruddiman and J. Richardson	1761
Glasgow	for John Bryce	1761
Edinburgh	by Gray and Alston	1763
Glasgow	by J. Robertson	1765
Glasgow	for John Orr	1761
Glasgow	by W. Duncan, senior	1761
Edinburgh	for John Wood	1767
Glasgow	by Jos. Galbraith	1769
Glasgow	by John Bryce	1770
Edinburgh	by Robert Clark	1770
Glasgow	by John Robertson	1770
Dundee	by Ogilvie and Chalmers	1770
Edinburgh	by Colin M'Farquhar	1771
Edinburgh	by Alexander M'Caslan	1772
Edinburgh	by Peter Williamson, 8vo	1772
Edinburgh	by Peter Williamson, 12mo. (six copies in one of the Trades Seats of St. Andrews)	1773
Glasgow		1773
Dumfries	by R. Jackson	1774
Glasgow	by John Bryce	1774
Glasgow	by A. Duncan	1774
Paisley	for Alexander Weir	1774
Edinburgh	by Archd. Neill	1775
Glasgow	for J. and J. Robertson	1775
	(Used in the pulpit of the city of St. Andrews.)	
Glasgow	for J. Robertson and J. Duncan	1776
Edinburgh	by John Gray and Gavin Alston	1776
Edinburgh	by A. Tweedie	1777
Glasgow	by J. and J. Robertson	1777
Edinburgh		(large type)
Dumfries	by Robert Jackson	1779
Edinburgh	by P. Williamson	1779
Aberdeen	by J. Boyle	1779
Glasgow	by Robertson, (used in pulpit of St. George's, Paisley)	1780
Perth	by R. Morrison and Son	1781
Aberdeen	by J. Chalmers	1781
Aberdeen	by J. Boyle	1781
Edinburgh	for C. Elliot	1781
Edinburgh	by J. Dickson (used in the pulpit of the Tolbooth Church)	1783
Glasgow	for J. Duncan	1783
Falkirk	by Daniel Reid	1784
Glasgow	by David Niven (in the bible of the South Church, Dundee)	1786
Edinburgh	by J. Dickson (printer to the Church of Scotland)	1786
Glasgow	by David Niven	1786
Glasgow	by J. and M. Robertson	1786
Glasgow	for J. Dickson	1788
Glasgow	by E. Miller	1789
Berwick	for Nisbet and Ross	1789
Aberdeen		1789
Edinburgh		1790
Glasgow	by J. M. Robertson	1790
Edinburgh	for J. Dickson and P. Hill, (a copy of this edition is used by the Moderator of the General Assembly)	1792
Edinburgh	by J. Moir	1793
Edinburgh	for the Booksellers.	1793
	(16 copies used by the Town-Council of Edinburgh.)	
Glasgow	by J. and M. Robertson	1793
Perth	by R. Morison, (used by the precentor of Canongate.)	1794
	(7 copies used by Magistrates of St. Andrews.)	
Glasgow	by J. and M. Robertson	1796
Paisley	J. Nelson for James Gillies	1796

Glasgow	printed by J. and A. Duncan	1796
Edinburgh	by J. Dickson, (printer for the church of Scotland.)	1797
Edinburgh	for the Booksellers	1779
Glasgow	James Imray	1798
Edinburgh	for, and sold by J. Gillies, Glasgow	1798
Ayr	by J. and P. Wilson	1798
Edinburgh	by Geo. Caw, for J. Gibson, J. Fairbairn, and J. Ogle, Edinburgh (Used by Magistrates of Cupar, by the Minister of Fala, and also by precentor of Tron Church.)	1798
Paisley	by Neilson and Weir	1798
Paisley	by Hugh Crichton	1798
Glasgow	by R. Chapman	1798
Edinburgh	by T. Maccliesh and Co.	1798
Edinburgh	by T. Ruthven and Sons	1799
Edinburgh	by J. Dickson, (pulpit of Tron Church)	1799
Edinburgh	by T. Ross	1799
Glasgow	by David Niven, (pulpit of Old Aberdeen)	1799
Paisley	by J. Neilson	1801

DR. LEE POSSESSES COPIES OF AT LEAST 70

EDITIONS OF THE CONFESSION OF FAITH,

*Not Printed by His Majesty's Printers, with the exception of one
by James Watson.*

Edinburgh	printed by G. Lithgow, printer to the University	1650, 18mo.
London	for the Company of Stationers	1651, 18mo.
London	for the Company of Stationers	1652, 18mo.
Edinburgh	printed for the heirs of George Anderson	1652, do.
Edinburgh	by Gideon Lithgow	1656, 18mo.
London	for Company of Stationers.	1656, 18mo.
Edinburgh	by Andro Anderson	1657, 18mo.
London	printed by A. Maxey for the Company of Stationers	1658, 4to.
London	by E. M. for the Company of Stationers, 2d edition	1658, 4to.
London	Do. do. larger paper and larger type	1658, 4to.
Edinburgh	by Gideon Lithgow	1659, 18mo.
London	by J. H. for the Company of Stationers	1662,
Glasgow	by Robert Sanders, printer to the Town	1669, 18mo.
Edinburgh	printed by James Glen and David Trench	1671, 18mo.
Glasgow	by Robert Sanders, printer to the city and university (the edition used by the Presbytery of Dundee)	1675, 4to.
	[The title bears that this is reprinted from the edition printed at London for the Company of Stationers, 1658.]	
Edinburgh		1679,
London	for the Company of Stationers	1688,
A	neat and correct edition (used by the Presb. of St. Andrews)	1688, 18mo.
Edinburgh	printed by John Reid	1689, 18mo.
Edinburgh		1694, do.
Edinburgh	by James Watson, Craig's Close	1701, 12mo.
Edinburgh	by James Watson in Craig's Close	1707, 8vo.
Edinburgh	by James Watson in Craig's Close	1708, 8vo.
Edinburgh	by James Watson, opposite the Luckenbooths	1710, 8vo.
Glasgow	by Hugh Brown, printer to the University (the edition used by the Kirk Session of Kirkaldy)	1714, 18mo.
Edinburgh	by John Moncur	1715, 18mo.
London	printed for S. Cruttenden and T. Cox, Cheapside, 5th edit. (the edition used by the Presbytery of Forfar)	1717, 8vo.

Edinburgh printed by James Watson, H. M. printer, 2 vols. 8vo. 1719, 1722.

[This edition was to have been in 3 vols. but was never completed.

It wants the directory for public worship, form of church government, &c. and contains various matters which are not of public authority in the church.]

Glasgow	by James Duncan, printer to the city	1721, 18mo.
Edinburgh	by William Brown and Company	1723, 12mo.
Edinburgh	by Thomas Lumsden and John Robertson	1725, 12mo.
Glasgow	by James Duncan	1727, 18mo.
Edinburgh	by T. Lumsden and J. Robertson	1727, 8vo.
Edinburgh	by Thomas Lumsden and John Robertson	1728, 12mo.
Glasgow	by William Duncan, Saltmarket	1732, 18mo.
Glasgow	by James Duncan	1732, 18mo.
Edinburgh	by T. Lumsden and J. Robertson	1735, 8vo.
Glasgow	by Messrs. Carmichael and Miller	1736, 12mo.
Edinburgh	by T. Lumsden and J. Robertson	1736, 8vo.
Edinburgh	by T. Lumsden and J. Robertson	1739, 8vo.
Glasgow	Collection of Confessions	1741, 12mo.
Glasgow	by Urie and Company	1743, 12mo.
Edinburgh	by T. Lumsden and J. Robertson	1744, 8vo.
Edinburgh	by T. Lumsden and J. Robertson	1744, 12mo.
Glasgow	by J Robertson and Mrs. M'Lean	1745, 18mo.
Glasgow	by J. Robertson	1746, do.
Glasgow	by J. Robertson and Mrs. M'Lean	1746, 8vo.
Glasgow	by D. Duncan	1746, 12mo.
Glasgow	by J. Robertson and Mrs. M'Lean	1749, 8vo.
Glasgow	by Jo. Hall	1749.
Glasgow	by W. Duncan	1749, 8vo.
Glasgow	by James Knox	1752.
Glasgow	by John Robertson, senior	1753, 8vo.
Glasgow	by J. Bryce and D. Paterson	1755, 12mo.
Edinburgh	by E. Robertson	1756, 12mo.
Edinburgh	by E. Robertson	1756, 8vo.
Glasgow	by Jo. Robertson	1756.
Glasgow	by Arch. M'Lean	1757, 8vo.
Edinburgh	by E. Robertson	1757, 12mo.
Glasgow	by John Bryce	1761, 12mo.
Glasgow	for R. Duncan, Saltmarket	1761, 8vo.
Glasgow	by William Duncan	1762, 8vo.
Glasgow		1763, 8vo.
Glasgow	by John Bryce	1764, 8vo.
Glasgow	by R. & A. Foulis (the edit. used by the presb. of Nairn)	1765, 8vo.
Glasgow	for Alexander Weir, Paisley	1768, 8vo.
Glasgow	by J. Robertson	1769.
Glasgow	by Robert and Thomas Duncan	1771, 8vo.
Edinburgh		1771, 8vo.
Glasgow	by John Bryce	1785, 8vo.

DR. LEE CAN PRODUCE AT LEAST 35

EDITIONS OF THE SHORTER CATECHISM OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND,

Not Printed by his Majesty's Printers.

Edinburgh printed and sold by John Moncur	1709
Edinburgh by J. Watson	1714

Edinburgh	printed and sold by John Reid	1719
Edinburgh	for W. Brown	1731
Edinburgh	by T. Lumisden	1732
Glasgow	by J. Robertson and Mrs. M'Lean	1740
Edinburgh		1742
Edinburgh		1743
Glasgow	by J. Robertson	1743
Glasgow	by John Robertson, &c.	1744
Edinburgh	by John Robertson	1745
Edinburgh	in Pearson's close	1749
Aberdeen	by J. Chalmers	1753
Glasgow	by John Robertson, senior	1754
Edinburgh	by Thomas Lumisden and Co.	1754
Edinburgh	by E. Robertson	1758
Edinburgh	by Alexander Robertson	1758
London	(beautiful edition.)	printed in the year
Glasgow	by J. Robertson	1764
Glasgow	by John Robertson	1764
Glasgow	by John and James Robertson	1774
Edinburgh	by Alexander Robertson	1777
Edinburgh	by Alexander Robertson	1781
Edinburgh	by David Paterson, Castlehill	1782
Edinburgh	by David Paterson	1784
Edinburgh	by David Paterson	1786
Edinburgh	by David Paterson	1788
Edinburgh	by J. Robertson	1788
Edinburgh	printed for the Society in Scotland for propagating Christian Knowledge	1791
Edinburgh	by Alexander Robertson	1793
Edinburgh	by J. Robertson	1795
Edinburgh	by J. Robertson	1797
Edinburgh	by J. Robertson	1799
Stirling	by C. Randal	1799
Edinburgh	by J. Robertson	1800
London	by W. Kent, High Holborn	1811

Most of these are superior to the King's Printers' editions 1806 and 1810.

Small books like the Catechism, for the use of children, are seldom preserved or collected, but the possessor of these has seen copies of several other editions published by unprivileged printers.

Several editions both of the Psalms, and Confession of Faith, printed at Glasgow by Urié, Foulis, Robertson, &c. ; at Aberdeen, by Angus, Chalmers, Boyle, &c. ; at Dundee, by Galbraith, Ogilvie, &c. ; and at Edinburgh, by Lithgow, Mosman, Lumisden, Fleming, Ruddiman, &c. had a very great circulation, and in appearance, at least, are superior to those of the contemporary patentees.

The Psalms printed by Blair and Bruce were at first deformed by various blunders affecting the sense. Thus the pulpit Psalm Book of 1801 reads in Psal. cv. 15, *ye* for *he*. Psal. cxliv. 13, *then* for *ten*, &c.

As the free printing of the Psalms, Confession, and Catechism for more than a century does not appear to have produced any injury, while it certainly promoted the circulation of these books and kept down the price, it may occur to many that no risk is to be apprehended, though all printers were to have the same liberty of printing the Bible in English as they have of printing the original Hebrew or Greek. At present it cannot be shewn that any security for accuracy exists. Thirty years ago the carelessness of some privileged printers had become a matter of reproach. Within the last twenty years many errors have been exposed, and greater care has consequently been exercised. The following page contains a few specimens of errors in late editions, which have been observed without being searched for. It would be well if some provision could be made for preventing the wilful or reckless introduction of such erroneous readings.

In the **MEMORIAL** and **ADDITIONAL MEMORIAL** several errors in the Bibles printed at Edinburgh have been occasionally mentioned. The following have not been pointed out.

4to Bible, Edin. 1808.	Micah vi. 16. <i>thereof</i> for <i>therefore</i> . Luke iv. 28. <i>hear</i> for <i>heard</i> . Gal. ii. 21. <i>in</i> for <i>vain</i> . James i. 27. <i>her</i> for <i>their</i> . Isa. xl. 3. <i>made</i> for <i>make</i> . Jer. xv. 10. <i>hath</i> for <i>have</i> .
4to, —— Edin. 1822.	Matt. xvii. 27. <i>comest</i> for <i>cometh</i> . xviii. 17. <i>the</i> for <i>thee</i> . Mark x. 52. <i>the</i> for <i>thee</i> . Luke vii. 21. <i>may</i> for <i>many</i> . Acts viii. 22. <i>my</i> for <i>may</i> . Matt. xvii. 27. <i>comest</i> for <i>cometh</i> . Luke viii. 14. <i>they</i> for <i>that</i> . xx. 15. <i>them</i> for <i>him</i> .
8vo N. T. Edin. 1812.	Phil. i. 25. <i>you</i> for <i>your</i> . 1 Pet. iii. 18. <i>offered</i> for <i>suffered</i> . Mat. xviii. 27. <i>comest</i> for <i>cometh</i> . Mark xi. 8. <i>strayed</i> for <i>strawed</i> . 1 Cor. iv. 6. <i>puffed</i> for <i>puffed up</i> . 1 Pet. iii. 18. <i>offered</i> for <i>suffered</i> . Ezek. viii. 1. <i>fifty</i> for <i>fifth</i> . Zeph. ii. 7. <i>cost</i> for <i>coast</i> . 1 Thess. iii. 7. <i>four</i> for <i>your</i> .
8vo N. T. Edin. 1816.	Heb. vi. 17. two lines transposed (unintelligible.)
8vo N. T. Edin. 1824.	
8vo Bible, Edin. 1823.	
12mo —— Edin. 1834.	
12mo —— Edin. 1833.	
24to N. T. Edin. 1832.	

These are not all that have been observed. More serious ones were formerly noticed. Some of the mistakes occur in successive editions, as *comest* for *cometh* in three, *offered* for *suffered* in two. In the same two the particle *not* is omitted in Luke vi. 29.

With respect to English editions, Mr. Horne states that Eyre and Strahan's 4to, printed in 1813, has been recommended by the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America to be adopted as the standard edition. It is however very far from being faultless. We have noticed 51 deviations from the best of the old editions, and, as far as we have examined, they are at variance with the original. The following occur in the course of a few pages. 1 Cor. iv. 13. *earth* for *world*, (*κοσμον*.) 2 Cor. iii. 11. *was* for *is*. 2 Cor. xii. 2. *about* for *above*. Gal. v. 18. *of* for *by*. Eph. iii. 5. *the* for *his*, (*αὐτον*.) Eph. iv. 16. *holy body* for *whole body*, (*παν τὸ σῶμα*.)

The following reading occurs in three editions of the Bible in the possession of the writer of this note, all printed by Eyre and Strahan, (in 1819, 1820 and 1822.) 1 Cor. viii. 6, *three* is *but* one God, for *there* is *but* one God.

Several of the stereotype editions printed in England are very incorrect. In a Cambridge edition printed by Smith, before 1817, the omissions are numerous. The following are specimens of material words omitted: Exodus xv. 25, *for them*. Num. vi. 5, *of the hair*. Num. xxv. 32, *high*. 2 Kings xi. 10, *of the Lord*.

1 John. v. 12, of God. John i. 3, all. John vii. 16, and said.
2 Cor. xi. 32, of the Damascenes. There are many other errors.

In fact, a revision both of the text and of the references is very much required. We would certainly exclude the references to the apocryphal books; and not a few of Blayney's.

We say nothing of the call for such a revision of the translation as Dr. Noah Webster (the lexicographer) has attempted in his edition of the Bible printed at Newhaven in 1833. Several obsolete and equivocal words have been altered, with great caution, and for the most part judiciously.

Such changes on the common translation have been tacitly effected from time to time in England, without any public authority, and without any challenge either from civil or ecclesiastical rulers. It is pretty generally admitted that improvements were introduced by the publication of the Oxford folio and quarto of 1769, with Dr. Blayney's marginal references. But there were several other alterations made at different periods by other irresponsible and unnamed agents, and it would surely be better, if such things are done, that the public should have warning, that they may be the more able to judge with what fidelity and care the task is executed.

In Scotland no undertaking of this kind seems to have ever been seriously contemplated. But in Scotland the people have been accustomed to borrow all the works used in the service of the church. They have never had a version of the Scriptures except what was borrowed. They have a borrowed Confession of Faith, borrowed Catechisms, a borrowed version of the Psalms in metre, (furnished chiefly by Barton and Rous.) The Translations and Paraphrases published in 1745 were almost entirely borrowed. The book with the same title, authorised in 1781, was also for the most part borrowed, though not without alterations, which ~~in~~ cases were not improvements. This little book is certainly of considerable amendment. We would deprecate any rash and irreverent innovations on the language which has been long consecrated as the vehicle of divine truth. But there are several passages in our English Bible which are better expressed on the margin than in the text. Some palpable inaccuracies in syntax might surely be corrected. Sentences might occasionally be rendered more perspicuous by the mere transposition of a few words. And in several cases a great improvement might be made, either by avoiding unnecessary variety in the rendering of the same original words, or by ceasing to use the same English word in the translation of two original words of different significations, as in John xvi. 23, where the verb *ask*, in the beginning of the verse, signifies *to propose a question*, and in the end, *to offer a petition*. The integrity of the sacred text could sustain no damage from changes such as have now been hinted at.

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries



1 1012 01216 5744

